TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface
page 3

Chapter I: Facts and Arguments that Theists Don't Want to Address
page 16

Chapter II: Efilism
page 31

Chapter III: Challenges Facing Human Development
page 64

Chapter IV: Miscellaneous Observations
page 72

Preface

Throughout this work I have done my best to avoid making baseless assertions as I have no intention of deceiving anyone into accepting upon faith anything I assert. What has been asserted without evidence can be dismissed without evidence. I know I've failed to cite evidence for every claim but that's because these claims are easily verified. Please forgive my laziness.

This book could be formatted better. I could probably expand upon some topics and transition more smoothly between subtopics but oh well.

Originally I wrote this work with the goal of providing a brief and easy to comprehend introduction to Marxist thought which more directly addressed belief in the supernatural than other Marxist introductory texts which typically gloss over said beliefs. I decided to dedicate a large portion of this book to addressing belief in the supernatural, especially theistic beliefs, because I know that said beliefs are the primary obstacle preventing a large proportion of people from even familiarizing themselves with the arguments of Marx and Engels, let alone accepting them.

Without getting into all of the details now I'll simply state that while I still believe the arguments of Marx and Engels to be true they fail to address more fundamental problems with the sentient condition which I believe to be insoluble. So my book is no longer an attempt to right the ship by showing the correctness of Marxist thought but has instead become an exposé upon the horror of life. I'm no longer interested in the long-term survival of our species or of life in general for reasons I'll explain in great depth later within this work.

I would say that the main source of most of the problems humanity faces (which are caused by humanity and which are not the product of inhuman natural forces such as the finitude of particular minerals we require to power our machines or the scarcity of freshwater etc.) are a consequence of how irrationally we behave and how seldom we require good reason to accept something as true.

Without getting into everything in the preface I'll simply state that few people have a good reason to reproduce; i.e. reproducing doesn't aid them in accomplishing any particular goal that they have in mind. Irrational beliefs, (beliefs

held without good reason) such as belief in an afterlife, empower people to behave recklessly. In the example of belief in an afterlife people are so empowered because no span of time is comparable to eternity which is definitionally of infinite duration and so only actions which help guarantee an eternity of bliss are worthy of being taken. Countless people have been convinced to ruin or even end their lives and the lives of others for the sake of a promised eternity of bliss.

Most humans are intelligent enough to consciously reflect upon what they believe, why they believe it, how these beliefs influence how they behave and upon how their behavior impacts themselves and others. Yet few people are in the habit of considering the consequences of highly impactful choices when said choices are socially acceptable. It's socially acceptable to adopt the faith of your parents without investigating other religions or even thoroughly familiarizing yourself with the dogmata and history of their faith. It's also socially acceptable to reproduce without giving any serious consideration to the probable fate of your offspring.

I would argue that we're not strongly incentivized or punished enough to warrant contemplation upon a number of topics even though they're actually quite consequential. I would say that we're not socially rewarded for questioning whether or not reproduction is a wise decision simply because we're all descendants of animals with a strong desire to reproduce as a consequence of natural selection and most people aren't in the habit of questioning their natural impulses. The majority of people are perfectly fine with stupidly and pointlessly procreating as other animals do and a society which chastised parents for their callousness would be on course for collapse.

Essentially we just take for granted behaviors for which we've been naturally selected and a culture which encourages strong contemplation upon topics like existence and procreation isn't going to be as successful at churning out future generations as cultures which never question whether or not our base impulses are worthy of being acted upon. People don't want to face consequences for giving into their base impulses; no one wants to suffer any ill consequence for indulging in alcohol, sex or overconsumption of food and as a species we really don't and never really did punish people for their mindless indulgence.

Since most people feel a greater affinity for the values and beliefs which they consciously hold than those base impulses which are unconsciously acted upon I'll begin by

addressing the greatest problem I see with the consciously held values and beliefs of most. As I said earlier most people irrationally (i.e. without and often even in spite of good reason) accept all manner of things as true. What do I mean when I say good reason? Well what should be regarded as good reason or sufficient evidence depends upon the circumstances. If a friend tells me it's raining outside I can take it for granted and if they are lying then it's pretty inconsequential anyway and there's not much to even potentially lose in taking them at their word. If someone tells you that there's a purple dragon rampaging across the city you should absolutely require solid proof before you accept that as true because given what is commonly known that's not even realistically possible and good reason to believe it would have to be something like verifiable video evidence, the corpse of the dragon, seeing the dragon yourself etc. whilst keeping in mind that evidence can be fabricated and that you're capable of deceiving yourself. Incredible claims demand incredible evidence. A great number of people accept all manner of incredible claims with what I would regard as insufficient evidence and I myself once believed a great number of ridiculous claims without any evidence.

Faith, belief in assertions which are not evidently true, can never serve as a substitute for knowledge in the search for truth. Acceptation of a claim should be based upon what the evidence indicates. Faith, accepting claims without evidence, isn't a virtue, it is a vice. To be susceptible to believing claims from charismatic speakers or well-written texts without evidence is to be gullible. The religious don't want to be labeled gullible but definitionally the faithful are gullible.

We only regard gullibility concerning supernatural beliefs as a virtue because for nearly the entirety of civilized history we've existed within societies dominated by religious authorities or secular leaders who have made use of religion. In other words faith being perceived as a virtue is merely a cultural tradition crafted by and for the benefit of those in a position to exploit the faithful. The very leaders who take advantage of you are the ones telling you that believing their claims without proof is a good thing for you. No one can articulate in what way faith is a virtue, faith can't aid you in any way and it's really foolish to assume that the creator or creators of our reality would appreciate your blind acceptance of claims from other people concerning such important matters even if said claims are accidentally correct.

One should not assert as fact things which they cannot show to be true and the correctness of their assertion doesn't excuse their ignorant espousal. Abraham Lincoln said the following: *"I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false, is guilty of falsehood; and the accidental truth of the assertion, does not justify or excuse him."* We're all guilty of ignorantly asserting things as true but doing so is irresponsible and potentially dangerous. If you're going to say something you should be aware of and concerned enough with the potential repercussions of your statements to develop a thorough understanding of the topic in order to prevent harm through the dispersal of misinformation. I'll get into this topic in greater depth later but to the religious readers of this text I'd ask them to ponder the level of knowledge their religious leaders have of other faiths, especially of every faith, as all faiths are equally incapable of proving their claims regarding the supernatural and the popularity of a religion does nothing to verify the truth of it's claims. For all any catholic priest knows the ancient faith of mongolian tribesmen may be closer to reality than their own; yet how many catholic priests know anything of non-abrahamic faiths?

The merit of the scientific method cannot be understated, it is this epistemological framework which has enabled man to more efficiently and effectively develop innumerable technical processes and devices and to correctly discern the properties of various aspects of our reality which we deem natural laws. The scientific method should be known to you but for the sake of clarity it bears stating within this work.

Curiosity or necessity sparks a desire to learn more about the process or processes underlying how something came to be or how something may come to be. To answer a question a researcher must become as informed about the topic as possible through conducting direct observations and or through studying relevant works by other investigators*. A hypothesis is an evidence based prediction which must be verifiable and falsifiable i.e. testable. A hypothesis is tested when the scientist feels confident that their predictions have a solid basis, this is a subjective determination made by the researcher and so repeated and rigorous testing of a hypothesis is essential to objectively determine the predictive power of said hypothesis through the production of a large volume of data. After testing has concluded the scientist or scientists involved examine the

data and determine whether or not it aligns with their predictions (i.e. with their hypothesis) and report their interpretation of the data along with all of the information relevant to the conditions and results of the experiments to the public.

Observed biodiversity caused Charles Darwin** to ponder the process whereby distinct populations of organisms diverge from their common ancestral population. Darwin proposed that populations, once isolated from one another, become distinct due to the different environments which they inhabit leading to those best suited for their new environment siring a greater proportion of surviving offspring than those less suited for said environment eventually leading to the development of specialized, distinct and sexually incompatible species descended from a common ancestral population. The process whereby the traits of those best suited for their environment become ubiquitous due to the advantages offered to the possessors of said traits Darwin called natural selection. Darwin published his hypothesis along with supporting evidence in a book entitled “On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life” in the year 1859.

A hypothesis is granted the status of theory after it has accounted for all relevant facts and withstood critical examination from the scientific community, this examination process is referred to as peer review. The theory of evolution is the only hypothesis regarding the development of species to be granted the status of theory as it is the only hypothesis to provide an adequate explanation for biodiversity which is concordant with the facts, to accurately predict what fossils paleontologists will uncover and where they will be found, it is the only hypothesis which has been corroborated by facts in related fields of research and it has yet to be falsified in any respect through the process of peer review.

The scientific community doesn’t regard a hypothesis as a theory without a firm basis and erroneous theories don’t withstand the test of time. A theory which fails to account for relevant facts is likely erroneous and it is certainly erroneous and in need of revision if facts contradict the theory.

Skeptics (including many theists) will object that the human brain is fallible and that consequently reason is fallible, therefore we shouldn’t trust what we ascertain through reason. No one denies that human reason is faulty,

that is why we verify hypotheses through experimentation. Our body of knowledge is shown to be true by the results which it produces. Reason is verified through the same means as our senses: through their results; that a man's senses are true is proven through his survival and that our scientific theories are true is shown by the countless productions and predictions made possible solely through the application of theoretical principles. Human reason is certainly capable of accurately deducing many things about our reality and those who deny that may as well take the final step and deny the existence of electrical generators, radio, the internet, automobiles, petroleum fuel, aeroplanes, lasers, pacemakers etc.

Some people have greater mental faculties than others just as some people have a stronger ability to detect scents or sounds. Some people are delusional in their thinking and jump to wild conclusions and some schizophrenics imagine sights, sounds and scents that don't exist. Delusional thinking and perception, the intelligence level of the researcher and the sharpness of their senses have no bearing upon what is repeatable, upon what can be experimentally verified or disproven through tests and observation. Furthermore our senses and thoughts aren't the only tools at our disposal for collecting data, we have many apparati and instruments free from human bias and error (other than in their design, calibration and application and these biases and errors are identified through use and progressively diminished as redesigns, recalibrations and relocations of apparati and instrumentation are conducted).

Theistic objections to the epistemological value of the senses and of reason are especially preposterous when you realize that all of their so called divine revelations are based upon sensual impressions. Why would the religious completely trust their senses in cases of divine revelation but wholeheartedly reject the ability of the senses and of reason to accurately ascertain facts (through practice) about our reality? Could they simply be self-deceiving hypocrites without any desire to learn the truth? Could it be that their desire to believe in the supernatural overrules their thirst for knowledge? Isn't it ironic that the very people who deny the possibility of ascertaining truth are so confident in their belief in the supernatural due to subjective impressions?

What alternative tools would theists propose in lieu of our senses and reason? What alternative method would they propose in lieu of praxis? What alternative tools and methods are capable of producing results comparable to those produced

through the utilization of our senses, instrumentation, apparati, reason and theories derived from conscious reflection upon experience? Without an effective alternative we're left without choice and are reliant upon our senses (and their mechanical extensions i.e. instruments and apparati) reason and experience (and the theories derived from experience using reason) in spite of all hazard. Theists love to point out the flaws and potential flaws within scientific methodology without providing a substitute because they're incapable of doing so; they won't propose a substitute epistemological methodology because they're aware that it will be less effective than the original if it is at all capable of discerning truth.

Falsification doesn't require substitution they may argue but it certainly does require substitution in epistemology, for to deny the possibility of knowledge is to deny not only reality but to deny even the possibility of discussion. If no one is capable of developing a working knowledge of anything, if the laws of physics can radically change tomorrow, as theists assert, then why even waste time discussing anything; just go live in your fantasy world devoid of permanence in spite of all evidence to the contrary. Ignore everything that has ever been accomplished or predicted through human ingenuity; ignore what's been effected through the development of practical experience into scientific experimentation, theorizing and the consequent theory-based praxis.

Michel Luc Bellemare has presented probably the strongest and most thorough argument against logical reason in his book "TREATISE ON NIHILISM". Michel argues that logic rests upon an arbitrary foundation because the mind automatically and arbitrarily selects phenomena for consideration, the mind then further consciously selects phenomena upon which to focus based upon arbitrary criteria. He argues that logic is essentially context-equating, equivalence-making and that these equivalencies are arbitrarily manufactured by the mind and are shaped by the preferences of the thinker; said preferences are influenced by culture, upbringing, education and other arbitrary factors. Michel says that man's thirst for knowledge is an extension of his will to power over the phenomenal world. *"Any sense of certainty is based on useful repetition, that is, arbitrary beliefs which are repeatable and consistently have utility."* His argument is that our knowledge of the material world is pure fantasy, that it is in fact self-deceiving belief in ideas which we ourselves arbitrarily construct in order to satisfy our will to power

and that facts are merely beliefs which accurately map to reality.

Any honest person will acknowledge that we will never be absolutely certain about anything but there isn't any truth to radical skepticism, subjectivism and relativism. One may argue that various scientific theories and facts are accidentally accurately mapping to reality (and in this sense I mean reality as it truly is, not merely as it is conceived by the mind) but this is simply a bold and unfounded objection that reality is incapable of apprehension by the human mind and of expression through language. One may argue that beliefs coincidentally mapping accurately to reality can enable man to accomplish great feats but when a *"belief"* system maps so accurately to reality as to rarely or never err and enables man to make accurate predictions about future discoveries can it not be said that we have an accurate understanding of reality itself and not mere performative efficacy? Are theories really nothing more than *"beliefs"*?

His arguments are eloquently presented within his book however I disagree with his premise; that knowledge is unattainable. The knowledge we develop through experience (be that experience handed down, daily or scientific) and through the application of theories founded upon experience, i.e. through praxis, to some extent reveal fundamental truths about reality and not mere working knowledge. We may never develop a completely accurate understanding of anything but our knowledge accurately reflects something otherwise it'd be useless. The burden of proof is upon those who deny the possibility of knowledge about the fundamental workings of our universe because the overwhelming preponderance of evidence indicates that we are capable of acquiring accurate knowledge. It is incumbent upon them to prove that a delusional set of beliefs or flawed epistemological methodology can make predictions on par with those of Einstein or lead to the development of technologies like the transistor, resistor, capacitor, internet, satellites etc.

From "Textbook of Marxist Philosophy" prepared by the Leningrad Institute of Philosophy under the direction of M. Shirokov pages 104-105: *"In the development of scientific knowledge a unity of relative and absolute truth is realized. On the one hand dialectic as a theory of knowledge admits the endlessness of the attainment of knowledge, never making absolute even its truest reflection, for if it did so it would cease to express the dialectic of the material world and thus lose its power of "guidance for action"; on the other hand dialectic admits the absoluteness, the fullness of the process of scientific knowledge as a whole and the*

presence of "little bits" of absolute truth in every scientific proposition, because it sees in it a firm basis for the assured advance of revolutionary practice. The refusal to admit the unity of absolute and relative truth leads inevitably to the admission of one of these to the exclusion of the other, leads either to the changing of theory into dogma, or to a direct denial that theory is a reflection of actuality and therefore capable of furnishing a scientific basis for the revolutionary changing of actuality. These alternatives are different in form but identical in essence; they both refuse to allow theory as "guidance for action"."

Here are some relevant quotes by Friedrich Engels which I feel dispel all arguments against the possibility of discerning truth from reality: *"The proof of the pudding is in the eating. From the moment we turn to our own use these objects, according to the qualities we perceive in them, we put to an infallible test the correctness or otherwise of our sense-perception. If these perceptions have been wrong, then our estimate of the use to which an object can be turned must also be wrong, and our attempt must fail. But, if we succeed in accomplishing our aim, if we find that the object does agree with our idea of it, and does answer the purpose we intended it for, then that is proof positive that our perceptions of it and of its qualities, so far, agree with reality outside ourselves. And, whenever we find ourselves face-to-face with a failure, then we generally are not long in making out the cause that made us fail; we find that the perception upon which we acted was either incomplete and superficial, or combined with the results of other perceptions in a way not warranted by them — what we call defective reasoning. So long as we take care to train our senses properly, and to keep our action within the limits prescribed by perceptions properly made and properly used, so long as we shall find that the result of our action proves the conformity of our perceptions with the objective nature of the things perceived. Not in one single instance, so far, have we been led to the conclusion that our sense-perception, scientifically controlled, induce in our minds ideas respecting the outer world that are, by their very nature, at variance with reality, or that there is an inherent incompatibility between the outer world and our sense-perceptions of it."*

Another quotation from Engels: *"In addition, there is yet a set of different philosophers — those who question the possibility of any cognition, or at least of an exhaustive*

cognition, of the world. To them, among the more modern ones, belong Hume and Kant, and they played a very important role in philosophical development. What is decisive in the refutation of this view has already been said by Hegel, in so far as this was possible from an idealist standpoint. The materialistic additions made by Feuerbach are more ingenious than profound. The most telling refutation of this as of all other philosophical crotchets is practice — namely, experiment and industry. If we are able to prove the correctness of our conception of a natural process by making it ourselves, bringing it into being out of its conditions and making it serve our own purposes into the bargain, then there is an end to the Kantian ungraspable "thing-in-itself". The chemical substances produced in the bodies of plants and animals remained just such "things-in-themselves" until organic chemistry began to produce them one after another, whereupon the "thing-in-itself" became a thing for us — as, for instance, alizarin, the coloring matter of the madder, which we no longer trouble to grow in the madder roots in the field, but produce much more cheaply and simply from coal tar. For 300 years, the Copernican solar system was a hypothesis with 100, 1,000, 10,000 to 1 chances in its favor, but still always a hypothesis. But then Leverrier, by means of the data provided by this system, not only deduced the necessity of the existence of an unknown planet, but also calculated the position in the heavens which this planet must necessarily occupy, and when [Johann] Galle really found this planet [Neptune, discovered 1846, at Berlin Observatory], the Copernican system was proved. If, nevertheless, the neo-Kantians are attempting to resurrect the Kantian conception in Germany, and the agnostics that of Hume in England (where in fact it never became extinct), this is, in view of their theoretical and practical refutation accomplished long ago, scientifically a regression and practically merely a shamefaced way of surreptitiously accepting materialism, while denying it before the world."

A relevant quotation of Vladimir Lenin: *"matter is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man by his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them."* Another statement with which I agree from Lenin: *"Knowledge can be useful biologically, useful in human practice, useful for the preservation of life, for the preservation of the species, only when it reflects objective truth, truth which is independent of man. For the materialist the "success" of human practice proves the correspondence between our ideas and the objective nature of the things we*

perceive. For the solipsist "success" is everything needed by me in practice, which can be regarded separately from the theory of knowledge. If we include the criterion of practice in the foundation of the theory of knowledge we inevitably arrive at materialism, says the Marxist."

Another wise statement from Lenin: *"The standpoint of life, of practice, should be first and fundamental in the theory of knowledge. And it inevitably leads to materialism, brushing aside the endless fabrications of professorial scholasticism. Of course, we must not forget that the criterion of practice can never, in the nature of things, either confirm or refute any human idea completely. This criterion also is sufficiently "indefinite" not to allow human knowledge to become "absolute," but at the same time it is sufficiently definite to wage a ruthless fight on all varieties of idealism and agnosticism. If what our practice confirms is the sole, ultimate and objective truth, then from this must follow the recognition that the only path to this truth is the path of science, which holds the materialist point of view."*

Another quote from Lenin: *"In a word, every ideology is historically conditional, but it is unconditionally true that to every scientific ideology (as distinct, for instance, from religious ideology), there corresponds an objective truth, absolute nature. You will say that this distinction between relative and absolute truth is indefinite. And I shall reply: yes, it is sufficiently "indefinite" to prevent science from becoming a dogma in the bad sense of the term, from becoming something dead, frozen, ossified; but it is at the same time sufficiently "definite" to enable us to dissociate ourselves in the most emphatic and irrevocable manner from fideism and agnosticism, from philosophical idealism and the sophistry of the followers of Hume and Kant."*

In short those who believe in the supernatural have no cause to reject that we're capable of discerning the truth about our reality. Our methods and conclusions are not merely flawed products of flawed brains but are being continually refined and applied to produce effective solutions to problems we face.

Spiritualists (by the term I mean those who believe in the supernatural in general) deny our ability to ascertain the truth because they are incapable of providing any firm proof for their claims. They're not able to provide any verifiable proof of any supernatural creatures and they can't construct a repeatable experiment which would indicate that claims about souls or an afterlife or clairvoyance have any truth to

them.

That spiritualists don't apply the same rationale that they utilize to dismiss the efficacy of reason to their own supernatural beliefs I feel best shows that the rationale is employed strategically and not in earnest. For if human reason is completely unreliable then we've no just cause to accept any claim made by anyone. Spiritualists will say that they know that their claims are true because they feel that they're true. They feel the presence of god or of a deceased relative or whatever. The feelings you have are just as much a product of your flawed brain as are the thoughts underlying the rationale for an argument. In other words if human reason is faulty due to it's reliance upon our brains then the emotional impressions spiritualists claim are evidence for the supernatural are flawed upon the same basis.

Spiritualists who fail to see this are either dumb or haven't considered the issue very thoroughly and those who are aware of this problem and who still make the claim that reason cannot be justified but that their emotional impressions are evidence for the supernatural are dishonest or lunatics. I feel that few spiritualists who dismiss reason and who posit that their emotions are evidence for the supernatural are lunatics, most are probably dishonest, dumb or inconsiderate people prone to accepting crazy nonsense after only a cursory examination of the relevant information.

The last group are the group I'm trying to reach having belonged to it myself in the past. We don't have enough incentive to dedicate the time to familiarize ourselves with unimportant matters. Ironically if the claims of any religion are correct then spiritual matters are the most important yet so few people within western nations really give these issues the time and consideration due to them, assuming that the possibility exists that any spiritual claims are true. I feel that this indicates that most people unconsciously consider spiritualist claims to be either unlikely or unimportant in any event.

Religious services are really just a way for westerners to feel at home with like-minded people nowadays. Practically no one takes the claims of any religious faith seriously as evidenced by their behavior and ignorance of even their own professed faith. So of course people who aren't seriously interested in or impacted by these topics will fail to seriously investigate the factual basis of claims that they accept as true.

There aren't any serious repercussions for claiming to believe (but not acting upon) delusional beliefs. For instance you can accept that distant celestial bodies

significantly impact our daily lives and it won't matter that you hold that belief if you fail to structure your life around that. Just as the accuracy of the gospel doesn't matter for *"christians"* who fail to consistently follow the majority of the commandments established by rabbi yeshua.

If nothing else hopefully this work compels theists to reconsider faith as virtuous and compels optimistic atheists to question their presuppositions about life.

Notes:

* Scientists are definitionally investigators for science is a continuous investigation into the natural world and it's mechanics.

** It's worth noting that Charles Darwin wasn't the first to propose that all life share a common ancestor but his observations and writings had the greatest impact upon the scientific community. Some of Charles' hypotheses are prefigured by the book Zoönomia written by his grandfather Erasmus Darwin of which Charles stated the following in his autobiography published in 1879: *"I had previously read the Zoonomia of my grandfather, in which similar views are maintained, but without producing any effect on me. Nevertheless it is probable that the hearing rather early in life such views maintained and praised may have favoured my upholding them under a different form in my Origin of Species."*

Chapter I: Facts and Arguments that Theists Don’t Want to Address

There are quite a few facts and arguments constructed from said facts which creationists don’t typically address because they’re incapable of refuting the central claims or of discrediting the evidence.

Faith has no place in anyone’s life, faith (belief in that which isn’t evidently true) doesn’t benefit anyone in any way. As I explained earlier an honest search for the truth inherently precludes faith. If you want to know god you shouldn’t accept the religion which your parents, grandparents or distant ancestors accepted simply because they did so; nor should you accept said religion because it is predominant in your culture. For the sake of argument, accepting that god is real and that knowing something about its nature is both possible and important, you better not roll the dice and ignorantly presume that any religion is true; you had better conduct a thorough assessment of the writings of all religions before coming to a final conclusion about the nature of god whilst keeping in mind that it is possible that no religion has the correct conception of god.

Quite frankly the search for god or knowledge of god is a waste of time and people pretending as though they have knowledge about god (or the supernatural in general) are deleterious for society.

A ridiculous quantity of time, resources and energy have been expended for the sake of fables. Ridiculous quantities and qualities of suffering have been inflicted for the sake of fables. Ridiculous quantities and qualities of pleasure have been denied for the sake of fables. I feel that we can all acknowledge that one person tortured or killed for the sake of lies is too many. Giving supernatural belief the benefit of the doubt and assuming that a single religion is correct then all of the others are collectively responsible for an insane toll of death and suffering for the sake of lies. Of course from my perspective all religions are collectively responsible for an insane toll of suffering.

Furthermore I’d say that belief in the supernatural hasn’t been responsible for more alleviation of suffering than it has inflicted. Religious adherents will of course reference charitable acts carried out by their followers; certainly fear of eternal torment has motivated some to behave in a less destructive and more empathic manner but how many more

have been motivated to slaughter and torment others for the sake of their faith? Certainly the latter figure outweighs the former by orders of magnitude.

I feel that the destructive effects of supernatural belief, the toll in suffering, is pretty evident for the above stated reasons and find it quite repugnant that any atheist has any tolerance for the continued existence of religion. Religion must be stamped out through thorough science education. Science education has already been quite effective in reducing the traditional inter-generational acceptation of the caretakers' faith. There shouldn't be any cultural tolerance of faith based beliefs especially when they're as philosophically regressive as islam and consequently capable of producing extremists who worsen society. Tolerance of belief systems which promote ignorance, prejudice and violence always ends badly.

Science is a progressive process of truth-finding which encourages revision to facilitate a more accurate understanding of reality; religious faiths and metaphysical concepts aren't amenable to correction or revision, they claim to be absolute truths incapable of being corrected or discarded. Those dedicated to absolutist concepts lack the honesty to abandon or reconsider their dedication to their faith based beliefs when information which conflicts with said beliefs is presented. For the absolutist, for the truly faithful, assumption trumps fact and their beliefs omit the possibility of revision. An honest person is willing to acknowledge when they're wrong and is capable of imagining evidence which would compel them to abandon even a strongly held position. Believers must admit falsification criteria otherwise their beliefs are held in bad faith, this goes for every belief; every scientific theory has falsification criteria. Many absolutist beliefs are unfalsifiable and so their adherents never have to imagine evidence which may compel them to re-evaluate their faith because their faith is based upon beliefs which are by their very nature incapable of being disproven. Maintaining beliefs which are incapable of being disproven is dishonest, you're deceiving yourself and if you espouse said beliefs you're attempting to deceive others. Unfalsifiable beliefs are deceptive by their very design.

Most religious traditions whose origins predate the industrial revolution maintain that our world is only several thousand years old. The extreme antiquity of our universe was firmly established when man discovered how to determine the

distance of stars from ourselves and once we learned that all stars are moving away from the center of the universe. Christian Doppler hypothesized that the coloration of stars was determined by their motion relative to the Earth. Doppler's predictions were vindicated by subsequent astronomers and our understanding of celestial motion and our observation equipment are now so sophisticated that we can determine the rate at which stars are moving. Creationists claimed that our understanding of space was largely erroneous by pointing to tired light theory and saying that the speed of light is variable therefore the stars aren't nearly as distant as we imagine them to be, therefore the universe isn't nearly as old as we calculated it to be. However, tired light theory didn't align with the observable data, so now young Earth creationists typically ignore red shift and it's implications altogether.

DNA sequencing presents a serious problem for those who argue that man was specially created because DNA tells us to which species we're most closely related and there aren't any glaring anomalies; so we don't see humans sharing 95% of their genomes with snails and only 40% with chimpanzees. That genomic sequencing is accurate has been shown countless times over through DNA tests conducted to determine paternity and to determine guilt or innocence of suspects in criminal proceedings. Creationists will sometimes respond to the reality that DNA tests will show that all apes (including man) are more closely related to one another than they are to other mammals (and that all mammals are more closely related to one another than any of them are to birds and so) on by saying that common genes indicate common design and not common descent. Biological organisms reproduce (genes replicate) so genes are in fact evidence of common descent i.e. of relation. By creationist logic DNA tests which prove paternity are merely indicative of common design.

By the logic of common design did yahoweh decide to give Adam dozens of endogenous retroviruses in the exact places in his genome as in other monkeys? Endogenous retroviruses make up about 8% of the human genome; viruses insert their DNA at random within the genome of the organisms they infect and ERVs are passed down to descendants in the exact same place within the genome. Why do we have dozens of specific viral DNA sequences in our genome shared with and in the exact same place as apes and by extension all monkeys? The majority of our ERVs are shared with all monkeys, how can creationists account for that? Donny Budinsky wrote a book claiming that ERVs aren't actually what they appear to be and that yahoweh

put them there for some unknown functions, hilarious. Just deny reality and pretend as though ERVs aren't what they appear to be, as though biologists can't identify viral insertions in the human genome. I suppose it's just a coincidence that we've got the same ERVs in the same places within the genome as all other monkeys.

Theists want to posit creation without pointing to any particular aspect of our universe that necessitates a creator, that necessitates an intelligent designer. Sometimes the more radical young Earth creationists will point to human DNA (and hope that you ignore the actual arguments and evidence put forth by origin of life researchers) when they claim that it couldn't have arisen by chance from the conditions of the early Earth; but most theists won't point to anything specific and will instead ask "how could this have come together by chance" referring to the universe in toto. More informed theists won't point to anything specific because they're aware of the fact that our knowledge of the universe is now so sophisticated that scientists are actually capable of providing satisfactory answers which remove the necessity of an intelligent designer for many aspects of reality i.e. they're fully capable of explaining the natural processes responsible for the formation of many phenomenon.

Theists can't explain why a creator was necessary for energy, time and space to exist nor can they explain how a being would've created these aspects of existence; physicists on the other hand are quite capable of articulating what evidence points to the eternal existence of energy and time and why said evidence is supportive of this conclusion. Theists need to explain why this or that particular aspect of reality or indeed the whole of reality necessitates an intelligent designer; further they need to show evidence concordant with that conclusion otherwise there cannot be said to be any possibility of intelligent design. One must provide evidence that the possibility exists before it can be seriously regarded.

Many particular aspects of our universe which young Earth creationists point to as evidence of intelligent design are pretty poorly designed if we're assuming an infinitely wise and powerful creator but incompetence aside the existence of these things (such as the Earth, stars, DNA, RNA etc.) can be explained as products of entirely natural processes. Thousands of books and who knows how many scientific papers have been dedicated to the topics of planet and star formation, the formation of organic life from inorganic matter and the emergence of patterns from random systems as a

result of natural forces. I encourage all theists to read some books or listen to some lectures about emergence theory if they're genuinely interested in understanding how complex systems form, unintended, as a result of natural laws.

Let's say for the sake of argument that our universe was created by an intelligent being. If our universe is as vast as astronomers say what cause would the creator have for concern with such a miniscule aspect of his creation? Furthermore how would we become aware of his desires for us assuming he wished to see us progress in any particular direction at all? These questions are really insurmountable and they're the cause of many religious believers to argue that astronauts, astronomers, governments and physicists are all lying about space in order to promote atheism, I once believed this myself. So they argue that space either doesn't exist or it exists beyond the firmament and that nothing is known of space. It is the desire to ignore data which refutes young Earth creationism which leads most of them to argue that the Earth is a flat disc enclosed by a firmament and that the reality with which we're capable of interacting is akin to a snowglobe.

Our reality must be a special creation enclosed within a dome because the bible says it is and more significantly it is the only way many creationists can maintain their faith; for if the universe is infinitely or even extremely vast what's so special about Earth? Why would the creator of such a vast expanse concern himself with an infinitesimal aspect of his handiwork? Young Earth creationists don't want to even attempt to answer these questions. Outlandish and unsupported beliefs are what must be taken on in order to maintain faith in young Earth creationism or a literalist interpretation of the bible (or any other religious text really) with the information we have about the cosmos.

Almost everyone who believes in any religion believes in the religion which their parents or those within their culture accept. Most christians will never read the Vedas, Zend-Avesta, Talmud, Eddas or Quran and most hindus will never read any of the aforementioned texts aside from the Vedas and so on. The faithful claim to value truth yet the majority fail to investigate the claims made by other faiths; even fewer will use their own mental faculties to construct an internally coherent and consistent spiritual conception but will instead defer to their favorite holy book or to their favorite theologian i.e. they'll trust illogical nonsense because it comes from an authority. The vast

majority of believers don't critically examine the claims made by their holy book or religious leaders and instead blindly accept as true whatever they're instructed to believe. To subscribe to any religious school or teaching is to remain willfully ignorant as none have any evidential basis. If you're going to assume that a creator exists at least admit your ignorance, defer judgment and be a deist until evidence compels you to acknowledge a particular faith (or none at all in the case of evidence which disproves a faith) as true. The blind acceptation of unfalsifiable claims is foolish.

I implore the religious to contemplate the following; if no one had told you of god or the spirit or of the supernatural in general would you even conceive of them, would you come up with the same concepts you currently hold and how do you imagine you would begin to suspect that there is a spiritual or supernatural aspect to our universe? One may respond "well people in the past conceived of a supernatural aspect to our universe therefore it must be real and capable of independent conception even now" but this is a view which totally disregards historical and present conditions. In no way could an educated person develop supernatural conceptions without exposure to them. Our great body of knowledge has removed the mystery and thus the necessity (and largely even the possibility) of educated persons independently developing supernatural concepts. Of the learned only the deluded or extremely dumb could conceive of a supernatural aspect to reality without previous exposure to such nonsense.

I feel as though this quotation from "The Art of Believing in Nothing" by an anonymous French author of the late 17th or early 18th century elaborates quite well upon the foolishness of assumption. *"I feel infinite regret that such an advantageous error should be false, I can't feel any such thing about the fact that I recognized this. I regret the untruth of my illusions, but not the loss of my illusion: I can't enjoy a false blessing. I despise a happiness that is imaginary, and I want to be happy as a result of the truth, not deception. When I find that my error, advantageous as it may be is false, then leaving it behind is an advantage. In addition, it doesn't depend on me not to know what I know or not see what I see. The conviction of my advantage can tilt the balance of what knowledge I have; but my will is not always the master of my judgement. I see, in spite of myself, the light that upsets me. Unhappy as I am to have lost my error, one should not desire to be happy by the pleasant dreams of a madman at the cost of his reason. The simple*

advantage of knowing one's misfortune surpasses that of being happy from ignorance or falsehood. Whatever the cost to me, then, whatever loss I may suffer, however sweet I found the false ideas I once had, whatever affection I may still feel for them, I can't help but cherish all the more the happiness of having recognized the deception. I was not happy, since what seemed to make me happy wasn't real, and I was truly unhappy to have been deceived. I protest, then, that the desire to know the truth and nothing else is what placed a pen in my hand. I've considered that if I had been born in Turkey, I'd be a Muslim; if I'd been born in Germany, I'd be a Lutheran; if I'd been born in England, I'd be a Calvinist; and that I am only a Catholic because I was born in France. And then, taking all sorts of precautions, with this, here is what occurred to me. The Religion I have isn't of my own choosing, it's the Religion of the State, of the Country, of the Prince, of my Parents, and not of my own. Sheer chance has given me a belief, and everyone assures me that if I'm wrong, if I was born unlucky, I run the risk of eternal punishment. It would, then, be reckless of me to be led in a matter of such importance by reasons such as these, being Catholic only because I'm French, and not following any other simply because I wasn't raised in it. Whatever the Prince's authority, the circumstances of place and of fortune, reflection, trampling on this insane reason of the Prince, education, and Country, must help me make a choice on which all my happiness depends. And if the Religion in which I was born turns out to be the best and the true one, I want it to be mine by choice and not by birth. I want it to be due to reason and not luck. Thus, I undertake to use my reason, to guide me to the truth that everyone claims to have on their side."

Most self-professed theists are truly atheists or agnostics in denial. That this is so is shown by their behavior; one need only take note of the many jews who find loopholes or ambiguities in various religious laws in order to subvert their meaning, the countless christians who completely ignore the old testament prohibitions and the wealthy muslims who fail to donate to the impoverished as the quran commands them to. Few people, especially within developed nations, take religion seriously; god isn't on their mind as they become intoxicated, have sex outside of marriage, lie, cheat, steal etc. God is on their mind after the act and their weak belief causes them to feel guilty so they'll pray or if they're somewhat more devout they'll try to make penance for their sins but once they've eased their own conscience they'll

return to their normal behavioral patterns which are totally ignorant of the divine. Most of us are atheists (at least insofar as our behavioral patterns are concerned), it's only that some of us choose to deny it to ourselves and everyone else.

If you don't really believe in god and don't behave as you're instructed to by your religion you should simply acknowledge the reality that your failure to behave in the prescribed manner is probably because of your lack of certainty regarding the truthfulness of your religion and you should question why you even pretend to believe. Most self-professed theists are self-deceiving, they continually ignore and disobey the strictures of their faith yet they never acknowledge that they evidently don't take any of it seriously. One could also argue that these hypocrites are simply examples of the disconnect between our conscious values and how we actually conduct our lives; either way it's not ideal.

I will present some of the arguments put forth by Jean Meslier in his posthumously published book "The Testament" as I feel they're quite sound. I have also inserted a few of my own arguments into this section.

As Jean Meslier argued (so much more eloquently than I) the Being responsible for the existence of our reality must be everywhere, within everything and everything must be reducible to it. This cannot be said of the immaterial god and it cannot be said of the spirit but it can be said emphatically of matter. Therefore we see that matter itself is the fundamental Being responsible for the existence of our reality as there isn't any evidence to suggest that the immaterial can create matter; furthermore there's no evidence which proves the existence of the spirit or of an intelligent creator. The omnipresence of matter shows that it is the Being responsible for existence and that the Being is not immaterial; the immaterial cannot be detected, imagined or even conceptually agreed upon in any manner.

Things which are absolutely possible or impossible are so in and of themselves and aren't dependent upon external powers. Excluded from this statement are things whose possibility are circumstantial, Meslier is talking only about things which are absolutely possible or impossible in and of themselves and which no Being is capable of altering. As examples he lists 2 + 2 which will always equal 4, the sum will always be greater than it's parts, 3 x 4 = 12 and a mountain will always have a valley, these are fundamental truths incapable of being rendered impossible by a Being and

these statements are possible in and of themselves in an absolute sense. To quote Meslier: *"It is evident that things are possible or impossible in themselves, i.e., that they obtain, as it were from themselves and from the depths of their nature, their possibility or impossibility, and this independently of the power and will of any other cause."*

Meslier argued that the existence of our universe must be possible in and of itself by it's very nature and that this is so cannot be disproven because no supernatural aspect to reality can be shown; furthermore the removal of this alleged aspect from something wouldn't cause it to perish but the removal of matter from a thing would certainly remove that thing from existence. To quote Meslier again *"Suppose the destruction of material and perceptible being, you will simultaneously destroy heaven and Earth and everything that can be contained in them. That being the case, it is evident, that the material and perceptible being has no link, nor any relationship with the spiritual and divine being; it is clear and evident that it presupposes no being but itself, and if it presupposes no other being, it necessarily must exist of itself, independently of every other being."*

If god exists eternally "before" time that tacitly admits that time is eternal and thus incapable of creation. If a creator exists only a short period before the creation of time then said creator isn't eternal and existed only a short duration before time. If god's existence has a definite beginning he must have been created but this inherently contradicts one of the fundamental characteristics of god upon which most agree: that he is eternal. God and time can at best be coeval with god taking priority over time in the same sense as the sun takes priority over light.

Time has no properties which can be associated with created things. Time has no dimension nor does it have mental or immaterial "spiritual" properties such as thought or emotion. Time cannot be created, one cannot instantly create 100 years of time, the time must simply pass. Duration is the only property of time and as shown earlier time is eternal i.e. it is a necessary condition for existence and is incapable of being "created" by something preceding it because nothing could precede it. Time is duration and no duration passes outside of time, nothing can transpire outside of time.

God couldn't have existed before and created space; for where did said creator exist before creating space? To be nowhere and not to be are the same; there isn't any fundamental distinction between nonexistence and "existing in oneself" nowhere. One cannot be "within" oneself without

being somewhere. One cannot exist outside space. There must be some relationship or proportionality between the cause and the effect. How could a god so finite he possesses no extension create infinite extension? Something eternal couldn't have been created in any event and because space is a necessary aspect of reality it proves that space is at least eternal if not also infinite. Creation requires action, how could action take place without space? Without a theater in which motion may occur no action can take place and thus space is a necessary condition for creation i.e. it cannot be created. Some will argue that god willed everything into being without motion but change is motion and for god to have "created" our reality he must have changed from his very earliest state and made the decision to create. That which is always the same can't help but stay the same at all times. God changed and created, god was in motion therefore he must have been somewhere even if only to contemplate. Motion, a change of situation or location, always requires space. I add to Meslier's argument that a brain cannot develop within a vacuum and so god necessarily couldn't precede the existence of time, space and matter as these are all necessary preconditions for the emergence of thought.

Matter doesn't create new matter from nothing and working existing matter into new shapes isn't what most theists mean by creation in any event. An immaterial being has no means at its disposal to create matter or even to shape it and to argue that god created or shaped matter through will or thought alone is to blindly assume the inconceivable. In what way is an immaterial god omnipresent and or omnipotent? How does god move without a body and how does he act? Will, thought, anger, love etc. are all derived from our physical brains. What meaning have these mental states for an immaterial god, especially prior to his creation of reality? Theists boldly speak of things of which they're ignorant. The fundamental aspects of reality (time, space and matter) are incapable of being created because nothing can exist without them. Theists argue that a being without a body, existing nowhere and outside of time created everything and everywhere from nothing. In what way does a being without a body exist? Where does a being exist if space (extension) has yet to be created by said being?

Theists who argue for an immaterial god face so many insurmountable difficulties in even attempting to describe their god that they clearly know nothing of what they speak. Every thought you have or are capable of having is in some respect related to reality. Emotions are physical states; physical states which are now capable of being mapped onto

the brain with MRI scans. Imagining that your thoughts and that consciousness have some immaterial foundation or origin is preposterous. If our thoughts had an immaterial origin they wouldn't be altered by changes to our brain induced by strokes, age, heat stress, concussions, narcotics, alcohol etc.

Meslier argues that an infinitely power, infinitely wise and infinitely good god would have made his presence and will known to all of mankind with such clear proofs that none could deny his existence nor misconstrue his commandments. That there are so many conflicting faiths with contradictory dogmata amongst men firmly proves that none are of divine institution. God has not deigned to show himself or even provide strong evidence for his existence; thus we can certainly conclude that if god exists he isn't disturbed by the many false prophets spreading errors throughout the world nor has he even the slightest interest in providing clear proofs of his existence so that all doubt may be conclusively and forevermore dispelled. According to nearly all faiths on Earth god is content to reveal his existence and his will to individuals or small groups under suspicious circumstances and to task these individuals or groups with promulgating "the true faith" amongst all mankind. God takes no action to prevent or punish the promulgation of falsehood and he won't reveal himself to everyone upon the Earth at once therefore he's either unconcerned with the beliefs of man or he doesn't exist.

Meslier also rightly argues that an infinitely powerful, infinitely wise and infinitely good creator would have never allowed evil to be introduced into the world; furthermore that evil isn't even punished, let alone prevented, proves that a good god doesn't exist. Christians will argue that god allows evil for the "greater good" yet what greater good has been done by the introduction of evil into the world? Genesis tells us that god allowed the serpent to corrupt mankind and everything else. What greater good has been effected by allowing the Earth and all of it's creatures to fall from a perfect state? What greater good has been brought about by allowing billions to suffer eternal torment? Pretending as though god created and allows evil for the sake of effecting a "greater good" is just a ridiculous attempt to ignore the reality that an infinitely powerful, wise and good god could prevent all evil without suffering any loss. Christians may argue that life is a test but the bible itself tells us several times that the names of those who will accept Christ and enter the kingdom of heaven are known in advance meaning

that free will is illusory and that god has allowed billions of people to be born, suffer and die just to suffer eternal torment for their failure to accept Jesus Christ as their supernatural scapegoat for the burden of sin.

Here are a couple of quotations from Jordanus Brunus Redivivus by an anonymous 18th century author: *"It only takes a little honesty to agree that experience is the only guide we can trust. Without experience of the things we would discuss, we can only babble; hence this cloud of errors which overwhelm every book about metaphysics. He who discusses those alleged objects which he thinks he sees outside nature is much like a child who stammers words like friendship, love, respect, duty, etc. without any knowledge of their meaning. The first reasons according to the prejudices of his parents or his own; the second repeats the words he learned from his tutor. If all men would use their natural lights, then the mere reading of mystical books about God, the soul, and the dogmas in general, would be sufficient to show them the falseness of all these vain, passion-begotten hypotheses. Simply examine such books and you'll be surprised to find that nobody has paid enough attention to the terms of their demonstrations: they all pivot on how the thing might be, and never on how it is."*

"If we look closely at the dominant character among men, we'll soon see how inevitable the belief in a first cause was. As their curiosity was beset by laziness, maintained by pride, but always limited by ignorance, it was inevitable that, to escape their uncertainty, they would fashion a being inaccessible to experience, by whose absolute omnipotence they could make sense of all the effects they couldn't understand"

Here are a few questions for theists. How can an omnipresent and infinite god exist apart from anything? In what way can an infinite being be distinct from anything? A being cannot be omnipresent without pervading everything yet no evidence exists which supports the existence of an omnipresent supernatural force or substance. Yet many religions maintain that god is both infinite and distinct from everything, that god can appear in some places or travel about. Why would an unchanging god create our universe after some period of time? If god is unchanging shouldn't the universe have appeared immediately? Why did he seemingly decide to create? Furthermore why would god wait billions of years for Earth to form and for humans to evolve on Earth?

Here are some strong arguments from “A Dissertation on the Formation of the World” by an unknown author. The infinite spiritual essence of god existed within and completely filled whatever space existed prior to the creation of matter. How did matter fit into this space after it’s creation? Was the spiritual essence compressed? If something is capable of being compressed doesn’t that indicate that it isn’t truly infinite? Can matter divide spiritual substance? Prior to the introduction of matter what were the boundaries of space? Was it spirit and if is so can spiritual essence be divided from spiritual essence? If spiritual essence can be divided is it truly infinite i.e. can something divisible truly be infinite? If this spiritual space was bound by matter this admits that matter is eternal.

An infinite god should fill everything, one may say that a spiritual being occupies no space but the space existed and must have been filled with something. If god occupies no space why don’t any holy books describe the creation of space, why do they instead either explicitly state or implicate that god existed within space? If an infinite god occupied all of space prior to the creation of matter how did matter fit into space? Did god divide his essence to make room for matter, is god not infinite and thus incapable of division?

Matter and space are obviously co-dependent so admitting that one is eternal is to admit the eternity of both. To quote the work directly: *“The creation of space is an absurdity; space is not a substance; it is a property of a substance; which is quite different. If space had always existed, there would always have been matter: but there has always been space: therefore matter is eternal.”*

Another quotation from the aforesaid text *“Extension is the essential property of matter; space has no existence of its own: which is only a consideration of Extension: we cannot separate the idea of extension from that of space: therefore they are one and the same thing. Extension and space are not and cannot be prior to the substance whose property they are, to the substance which is their object. Therefore it is useless to know what Extension or Space matter occupied. To occupy implies posteriority for that which is occupied. Therefore it was unnecessary for matter to occupy space. But it was necessary for Extension and space to be found wherever there was matter. Wherever substance is, there its essential property is also.”*

The text also argues the following; how can an infinite and consequently indivisible being divide itself in order to produce matter? Furthermore matter is itself infinitely

divisible so how could an indivisible being give rise to something so fundamentally different from itself i.e. how could the indivisible essence of god give rise to divisible matter. How could something give rise to something fundamentally different from itself, something with which it shares absolutely no properties? The properties of spirit and matter, their essence, are completely different from one another and so we're justified in doubting that one could give rise to the other.

"A Dissertation on the Resurrection of the Flesh" (of undetermined authorship but possibly Thomas Browne) tells us that the matter which comprises organisms today once belonged to prior organisms and so the general resurrection described in various religions couldn't be effected as matter cannot be created ex nihilo. As an example the author says that the son of a farmer who subsists upon the vegetation grown in soil in which hundreds of men have decomposed would, upon the day of resurrection, have to sacrifice his own matter to them and these men to others in turn in an endless chain. If one wants to posit that the resurrection will be purely spiritual then they never truly perished and aren't in need of resurrection in any event as the spirit is eternal.

In summary, nothing we're aware of required an intelligent designer or supernatural explanation more generally. We understand or are currently developing an understanding of the natural processes responsible for the formation of everything from life, to mountains, to planets and stars and even the universe; furthermore nothing indicates even the possibility of a creator. Simply stating that god exists proves nothing. Anyone can say anything; I can say a dragon flew over my house during the September 11 world trade center attack but that doesn't mean it actually happened. The burden of proof is upon those who believe in the supernatural to show something that indicates the possibility that reality has a supernatural aspect.

A common "proof" of the supernatural is human cognition but there's nothing immaterial about how we think or about what we think. Every idea which we're capable of forming is in some respect either drawn from reality or is completely meaningless. Take god or the soul for instance, no one can say anything meaningful about either of these concepts until they connect them to reality either through alleged interactions (such as the soul influencing thought) or by comparison with natural forces e.g. the flow of thought, the

purity of the soul, the goodness of god etc. Every meaningful abstraction is capable of being imagined; we can imagine logic, goodness, evil, industriousness, laziness, deceit etc. in concrete examples. Every meaningful abstraction is derived from and capable of being applied to reality; abstractions are only comprehensible and communicable insofar as they're applicable to reality. Thus the ease with which people accepted the idea of material gods consuming food and drink, reproducing, dying etc. but the difficultly of convincing people to accept the "existence" of immaterial gods. Every abstraction is derived from reality; good, evil, heavy, light, dark, sinful etc. are all drawn from human experience. No one can point to any meaningful, significant, abstraction which is unimaginable i.e. inapplicable to reality; they can only list nonsense that must be compared to real experiences in order to be comprehensible: things such as spirit, reincarnation, the afterlife etc.

It should be obvious how imagined things are wholly material. Nothing immaterial is capable of being imagined because immaterial "things" are definitionally nonexistent i.e. fictitious. Everything capable of being imagined, even the most fantastic things, are all material being either audible or visual. Anything imaginable is capable of being artistically rendered because it is material. Nothing within human thought hints at an immaterial origin for consciousness.

Emotional states are just as material as anything else. Different emotional states are produced by different sets of biochemical processes. Emotions as abstractions are only comprehensible, like any abstraction, when imagined (or at least described) within their proper context.

To quote Lenin: *"Our sensation, our consciousness is only an image of the external world, and it is obvious that an image cannot exist without the thing imaged, and that the latter exists independently of that which images it."*

Chapter II: Efilism

Efilism is a philosophy expounded by Inmendham which acknowledges that the phenomena of sentience has created a zero-sum game for the organisms who have it. In this chapter I will expand upon this statement to the best of my ability in an attempt to convince you that the efilist assessment is correct. To quote Inmendham's description from his website www.efilism.com: *"EFIL is life spelled backwards. Life is **C**onsumption, **R**eproduction, **A**ddiction & **P**arasitism. It's **C.R.A.P.** We, as sentient feeling organisms, are the products of 4 billion years of the holocaust of evolution - it's not a good story, and it's not one worth continuing. EFILism is a conclusion, derived from an assessment of the full summation of the history of the reality of sentient life on Earth. It is the most important responsibility, of the only sentient species intelligent enough, to effectively manufacture a graceful exit strategy for life on planet earth. It is the responsibility of the Efilist, to enter into the battlefield of ideas with the rest of the human race, and try to the best of ones ability, to argue for an understanding of the truth and consequences of our circumstance on this planet. The most precious thing in the entire material universe, is the capacity for a consciousness to generate a sensation of horror and unpleasantness. For that is where all value in the universe is generated - in the consciousness of feeling, sensitive creatures."*

To quote Inmendham again:

"We observe reality
We see physics become chemistry chemistry become biology
We see that some biology manifest consciousness (a sentient brain)... The ability to feel
We personally experience this function of feeling
We personally experience feeling good and feeling bad...
Having feeling experiences we would re-experience and having feeling experiences we would never wish to experience again.
The feelings themselves are negative and positive and cannot be changed by interpretation or context.

Conscious beings having to endure bad feeling experiences is the price paid... The price is too high and it ought not be paid."

A friend of mine wrote out his stance (with which I completely agree) as a logical syllogism:

"P1 Life serves no essential function in the universe.

P2 All life on earth will go extinct regardless of any actions taken.

P3 Life is full of large amounts of gratuitous suffering.

C If we care to reduce the insanely large amount of suffering which will happen before the inevitable extinction of all life on earth then we ought to carry out omnicide"

Ultimately nothing anyone does is of any significance in the grand scheme. Eventually the cosmos will become incapable of sustaining life and every action taken by any organism will become irrelevant. Inevitably all life throughout the cosmos will be terminated; probably long before the cosmos reach a big crunch state or go through a big rip or heat death or whatever will eventually transpire. Though we may be ignorant of the exact fate in store for the cosmos we can rest assured that it won't be habitable in perpetuity. After all only a tiny portion of our own homeworld is even habitable for us right now so it's delusional to imagine that life will be eternally possible. Why concern ourselves with anything? Why behave in any particular manner? Why plan for the future or reproduce? Isn't it unreasonable to worry about a future devoid of life? Why even continue living?

These are all important questions that are seldom asked or answered. We can state with absolute certainty that the universe won't be capable of sustaining human life indefinitely so all of our efforts are ultimately for naught. Our own planet probably won't be capable of sustaining human life much longer due in large part to our own actions so it's delusional to concern yourself with the future of our species. Nothing we do has any permanent impact, we're of such tiny magnitude, we have such a tiny impact and our species will persist for so short a duration that no extraterrestrial species will probably ever be aware of our existence and the universe will continue without missing a beat long after even the most trace evidence of our existence disappears.

Life is an inconsequential accident. Consciousness is another inconsequential accident* and the proportionately high level of intelligence which we've evolved is yet another inconsequential accident. By the aforesaid I of course mean that these facts are inconsequential in an ultimate sense; of course the evolution of life, consciousness and intelligence on Earth are of import only to ourselves and the other

organisms upon the Earth. Life, this cosmic accident (like everything), is merely the product of physical laws. Life has no purpose or meaning and the stories we tell ourselves to make existence more bearable don't alter that fact. Physical laws won't break down when our species goes extinct nor will the universe magically dissipate; our presence or absence has no bearing upon the ultimate fate of our planet or our solar system or our galaxy or of the universe.

We don't exist to accomplish any particular goal and our universe isn't the handiwork of a creator. Like all other fish, we humans are simply adhering to the rewards and punishments our brains mete out for experiencing different sensations. We're all simply attempting to experience the maximum amount of pleasure at the minimum expense of pain.

Our experiences are the only thing that are of any real import. Life itself isn't inherently pleasurable or valuable. We value life for the experiences we can receive through it. We don't value life in and of itself. If life were valued in and of itself then there would be people arguing that a person imprisoned within a completely darkened cell, deprived of all auditory and visual stimuli and whose only food is bland and whose only drink is water could be happy. Yet no one would sincerely argue that a person could be happy under those conditions, surely a lot of people could tolerate life under those conditions but no one would consciously value such a lifestyle. No sane person would, in good faith, argue that anyone could find such a life worthy of being lived and most people would definitely prefer nonexistence to existence given those conditions.

A person under the aforesaid conditions would only consciously choose to continue life under the assumption that their conditions may improve. Most people don't even really stop to contemplate if their lives are really worth the pain that they endure. Most people mindlessly continue living as they've been naturally selected to. Even people living the most agonizing and deprived lives have chosen to continue as a consequence of their inborn, inherited and unconscious desire to persist. The innumerable people who've lived most or even all of their lives as prisoners or slaves are, for me, sufficient evidence that our desire to exist overrides any rational calculation as to whether or not this life is worthy of being lived.

To illustrate my point just think of all of the negative, neutral and positive experiences you've had over the course of your life. Of course there are plenty of moments that are negative with positive aspects and vice versa but for this thought experiment it's either definitively negative or

positive if you either wouldn't or would live through it again if you had the choice to do so and neutral experiences are those which you feel indifferent about experiencing again. If someone told you that you could experience all of the enjoyable moments of your life over again back to back at the cost of having to subsequently and sequentially experience all of the neutral and negative moments again would you go through with it? I know I wouldn't and I doubt that many people would. I wouldn't go through all my time trapped in traffic, waiting in various lines, tossing and turning in bed for hundreds of hours unable to sleep and all of the other boring experiences in exchange for anything; and I most certainly wouldn't go through all of the truly painful experiences I've gone through for anything. I wouldn't even want to go through all the joint pain I've experienced in exchange for anything.

We tolerate the boring and horrible experiences because we suspect that the next bit of enjoyment is just around the corner and most people are capable of finding enough satisfaction to continue crawling along; there's enough "good" between the bad or neutral experiences to carry you along. I don't calculate the toll of suffering that I experience so that I may experience the next dopamine or serotonin hit and most organisms in general aren't even capable of performing that calculation. Furthermore almost no one considers the toll exacted upon other sentient beings for the sake of their pleasure. Few people are in the habit of considering the pain that others have to experience in order for them to enjoy whatever it is that makes life a little bit more tolerable.

Living isn't a rational decision, we don't choose to continue living after calculating whether or not the negative moments are worth experiencing in order to live through the satisfying moments. We don't look at our life circumstances and consider how much pain we're likely to go through. If most people performed the calculation (using whatever metrics they like) to determine whether or not to continue living then it'd be impossible to maintain slaves and nations whose standards of living are extremely low would become depopulated from mass suicide.

Most people don't think or behave rationally and to illustrate that it's enough to point to a few examples of commonly made and extremely consequential irrational individual and collective decisions. Just to start with you can point to the innumerable people (myself in the past included) who accept things as true on the basis of faith

i.e. without evidence. Of course you could also point to the innumerable people who've accepted claims as true based upon poor argumentation e.g. illogical statements and faulty reasoning.

No one is perfectly rational or logical. I'm not interested in establishing a false dichotomy in which the efilist movement is comprised solely of perfectly rational people and its opponents are all irrational imbeciles. Obviously the vast majority of people are rational enough to survive and function within society. The real problem is that people aren't accustomed to thoroughly considering the consequences of their choices so long as the consequences fail to substantially negatively impact themselves.** Furthermore their stated goals, their consciously held values, often conflict with and or are negatively impacted by their thoughtless choices.

I'm sure that most people would state that they're interested in eliminating suffering in the world yet they continue to purchase animal products, a purchasing decision which is directly responsible for inflicting harm upon billions of nonhuman animals each year and of course it's simply an inefficient means of producing nutrients and is indirectly responsible for human deaths caused by starvation. So you could ask these people how many pounds of their favorite meat product (or how many purses or coats or whatever) justify someone starving to death? Of course most would be appalled by the question (never realizing that they're actually indirectly contributing to starvation casualties with every animal product purchased) and they would tell you that no one should starve, that no quantity of animal products justifies a human being dying of starvation.

So there's a disconnect between their stated value that human lives matter and that no human should starve to death and the consequence of their choices. The ideal world, the desired outcome, isn't brought about by their choices.

Another good example of the disconnect between intent and consequence is people placing solar panels in less than optimal locations. As a species of course most of us are interested in maximizing efficiency in every facet of our lives if we're able to do so. We're aware that we exist within a resource scarce world so we try to use what's available to produce the greatest output, we try to maximize utility. Yet there are people who set up solar arrays in less than optimal locations under the delusion that they're doing something good (by producing energy in an environmentally friendly way) when in fact they're misallocating scarce resources by not deploying the panels in the regions of the

Earth with the most sunlight. All resources are obviously finite and the metals required to manufacture a lot of different types of solar panels are quite rare.

All this to say that efilism is a more accurate and rational perspective upon life because it dares to question the fundamental presuppositions which we've been biologically and culturally programmed to take for granted. Furthermore efilism, being an anti-theistic and anti-supernatural perspective and which has no delusions about life possessing meaning or purpose looks at the world without the embellishments that most theists and some atheists do.

A lot of people ask themselves whether or not their lives as individuals are worthy of being lived but few ask whether or not the phenomenon of sentience and life are intrinsically good or worthy of continuance. Most people don't thoroughly consider what life entails for sentient (capable of subjective experience including pain and pleasure) organisms; most don't contemplate whether or not life is a good development ("a happy accident") or if it's actually tragic. Most just think of their own circumstances and their own psychological state and extrapolate a vague notion about the value of life based upon said self-assessment.

Of course the charge is always made by at least some optimists that pessimistic outlooks upon life are the product of diseased minds, of people who have experienced great personal loss or who have failed to achieve something that they greatly desired. While I'm willing to acknowledge that that's certainly the case for some pessimists those charges don't deserve a thorough response as anyone can verify the factual nature of pessimistic claims about existence. The efilist conclusion that life has negative value is based upon an objective assessment of life itself, totally divorced from personal considerations. Efilism isn't pessimistic for the sake of pessimism or as a consequence of disturbed or diseased minds.

To demonstrate the veracity of the claim that life is bad it's enough to reiterate that life isn't intrinsically pleasurable. You're obliged to seek pleasure; furthermore you're obliged to struggle for relief from hunger, thirst, temperature extremes etc. These facts don't hit home so hard for those within industrial societies but for nonhuman animals these truths are salient. To live is to struggle.

In truth pleasure is simply a temporary release from an unwell condition. Pleasure is simply your brain rewarding you for satisfying (alleviating) needs that only need to be satisfied (alleviated) as a consequence of your existence. At

the very least all pleasurable experiences, all pleasant neurological states (like happiness), are an alleviation of boredom. As a consequence of the evolution of highly sapient sentient beings we (we referring to all highly intelligent sentient organisms***) are obliged to seek stimulation to alleviate boredom which can become fatal if not relieved. I can personally attest to the lethality of boredom as it's driven me to contemplate suicide dozens of times over the course of a decade. Some may regard this as a joke or as quite a stupid or petty reason to end one's life but that's their subjective assessment and plenty of people have already ended their lives because they fail to find anything stimulating enough to justify continuing the struggle for existence even if said struggle is comparatively mild viz-a-viz the struggle imposed upon our ancestors or upon currently existing nonhuman animals.

Your addiction to stimulation, to pleasure, isn't a good justification for continuing your life as an individual or for continuing our species or the phenomena of sentience in general. Chasing pleasure is ultimately pointless, it accomplishes nothing. Addiction to sensation is the defining quality of life, it's what drives almost all organisms onward aside from the whip of pain. You've got the carrot of enjoyable bio-chemical garbage (pleasurable neurological states) and you've got the whip of painful bio-chemical garbage. That's what your existence as a sentient being is, chasing pleasure and running from pain. The only "good" experiences in life are those which satiate your in-built biological addiction to specific neurological states, to specific bio-chemical releases and interactions.

Our addiction to pleasant sensation is insatiable. The pleasant feelings are transient and must be induced endlessly in order for us to tolerate existence. You can't get by, you can't be satisfied, with having a single drink or meal you like within your lifetime then consuming tasteless food and drink for the remainder of it. You can't enjoy playing a video game once and then never engage in any recreational activity ever again and remain happy. You can't remain happy without having something to induce pleasant neurological states again and again. We're all addicted to pleasure.

If you've got any sense you don't endlessly feed an addiction, especially an addiction that accomplishes nothing. If we were interested in endlessly inducing particular neurological states we could do so, more effectively and efficiently, to brains grown in petri dishes. We could grow billions of brains in laboratory petri dishes or vats and they'd require very little to be kept alive and those brains

could be endlessly pleasurably stimulated by electrodes without having to experience any pain. That's how we would elect to maximize happiness if we were actually interested in doing so.

Most people presented with this suggestion will probably say that it's stupid and pointless to grow brains and to stimulate them in order to maximize happiness and I'm in full agreement with them. In fact the reaction I anticipate from most people illustrates my point exactly because fundamentally all sentient organisms differ little from the brains in dishes or vats.

Our brains are where the sensations (negative and positive) that we value take place and it's where cognition takes place. Our brains are what we value as ourselves. The rest of our body is really just a vehicle for accomplishing the tasks necessary to induce the next pleasurable sensation whilst avoiding the painful sensations. Of course various parts of the body produce the chemicals we need to experience different feelings, it's a bit of a simplification for the sake of argument but the brain is the essential piece that couldn't be replaced with some artificial systems without losing what we would define as ourselves.

People may say that we're different from brains in a petri dish or vat because we're obliged to amble about in search of pleasure and because we're obliged to utilize our sensory apparati in order to induce pleasure but these are meaningless distinctions. Ultimately your feelings are dictated by bio-chemical interactions and to demonstrate this we can artificially induce different emotions within sentient brains right now through chemicals. Some of the most obvious examples are mood adjusting drugs for people with "neurological defects" or "chemical imbalances". Feelings are determined by chemical interactions within brains and have nothing to do with the sensory equipment such as skin, eyes, tongue or ears; therefore the pleasurable or painful states of brains within petri dishes or vats are just as authentic as those within "natural" brains because they're physically indistinguishable and the supernatural (having no factual basis) cannot be used to define a difference between the "natural" and laboratory grown brains. Sure, the laboratory grown brain can't remember or tell itself some bullshit story about the time that a particular pleasurable experience was induced but that's a pretty trivial distinction quite frankly. Sure the laboratory brains can't see, hear or taste but the same pleasure you receive from those sensory inputs can be perfectly replicated; therefore the feelings, the neurological states, of the laboratory brains are authentic.

If they can't be regarded as authentic because of a lack of sensory input then the experiences of people who are congenitally insensitive to pain who are also blind and deaf aren't authentic either; if you want to argue that the experiences of the laboratory brains aren't authentic whilst the experiences of the aforesaid person are you need to define the characteristic(s) which justify making a distinction, if the characteristic is that one was born and the other was grown you're displaying an irrational bias because the lab brains are structurally and functionally identical. Our organs aren't special because they're the product of "natural" biological machinery i.e. we're not special because we were born. Form and function are relevant not origination or means of construction.

To get back to my main point: yes, inducing pleasure in the lab grown brains is stupid because it accomplishes nothing. Life in general accomplishes nothing. Nothing that you as an individual, that our societies or that our species will ever carry out will have permanent consequences. Even if it takes tens of billions of years our descendant species will go extinct and the entire universe will inevitably be totally devoid of regions capable of sustaining life.

Accomplishments are illusory; purpose and meaning are fictions of our own imagining which serve to propel us through life upon the deluded notion that we're "accomplishing" something. There is no purpose to anything and any purpose you invent won't empower you to accomplish anything. Even in the short term the impacts you or a group have upon your community (and in the long term that even an entire culture have upon humanity) will be undone by others and forgotten. Meaning, like purpose, is a mental construct that exists nowhere in nature. Reality is devoid of meaning; meaning is a fiction imposed upon an uncaring universe in an attempt to make existence more bearable for the sufferers within it.

So not only is "natural" life just as pointless and meaningless as the artificial life of the brains in dishes or vats but the natural life is less efficient in every respect if our goal is to maximize pleasure and minimize suffering. The lab brains aren't obliged to suffer to experience pleasure and the toll in suffering that they exact upon others in order for their existence to be maintained is minimal compared to the toll that we exact. Totally disregarding all of the suffering we inflict upon nonhuman animals as a consequence of industry and transportation of materials, we still inflict a great deal of suffering upon countless people (of whose existence we're unaware) just to

maintain ourselves, westerners exact an especially high toll. The upper classes of every human society have always contributed little or nothing essential to the continued functioning of society at the expense of an obscene quality and quantity of suffering placed upon the lower classes. However, even working class people within impoverished nations are still obliged to finance the suffering of others in order for the necessary tasks to be completed so that the members of that society may continue existing.

A lot of people will try to downplay it and say it's fine that some people have to become crippled or die horrifically so that we may have roads and bridges, or that it's fine that some people end up with serious ailments from performing any number of labor intensive occupations. Maybe you could make that argument as regards tasks essential for the continuance of our lives but there are plenty of useless and inefficient occupations being fulfilled solely for the pleasure of a few at great expense to many. Inmendham points to sports as a great example. Sports provide only a momentary distraction for whatever percentage of the population that even cares about them at the expense of an unknown number of successful and aspiring athletes. It can be phrased quite well as Inmendham does: how many paraplegics does the performance of a high level professional sports game justify? There are plenty of amateur and professional athletes who are suffering every day as a consequence of their choice to play sports, this suffering is part of the price of every sports performance. How many teenagers become crippled temporarily or even permanently as a consequence of their attempt to become professional athletes? How many additional traffic accidents (how many people being crippled and how many people being burned to death in the wreckage of their car) are justified by a football game? A lot of people will blow it off, say I'm being dramatic, but these are real consequences of the performance of these pointless activities. Then there's just insanely cruel and pointless garbage like children working in diamond mines so that some rich creep can wear a shiny rock. It's an expenditure too stupid to justify, too stupid to pretend as though it's fine.

Your life might be fine and the living standards of the majority of people within your personal circle or your community or even your entire country might be extremely high but the toll of suffering to maintain those standards is consequently extremely high somewhere else; there are always impoverished people within foreign nations suffering to produce the products that you consume. Even within countries

where standards of living are extremely high there are still people who suffer greatly just to get by. There's always sewer workers, coroners, slaughterhouse workers, miners, construction workers, morticians, pest exterminators etc.

Life would only really be "worth it" if you're born into a wealthy family, aren't obligated to do anything and are totally devoid of empathy so that you're unconcerned with the toll of suffering exacted upon others so that you can continue your lavish, excessive and wasteful lifestyle. However even within this scenario you're still pointlessly satisfying an unnecessary and insatiable addiction to pleasure. So even in this scenario it's still stupid but it might be tolerable for the assholes who get to live it; well at least it might be until their health catastrophically declines as it does for just about all organisms before death. Even the incredibly privileged are still likely to suffer a great deal before they expire. It is also worth pointing out that even some of the wealthiest people on Earth end their lives for various reasons other than their "physical health" (obviously your brain is physical but it isn't to what most people are referring when using the phrase physical health); so even some percentage of the most privileged upon the Earth fail to see life as worthy of being lived.

Personally I can say that there's no quantity of money that would radically alter my life because there's nothing I want to buy. I'd move to a safer, quieter, warmer and drier area and I'd quit working but there's really nothing worth doing for me. Becoming wealthy won't eliminate all of the suffering within the world in any event so I'd be distraught irrespective of my personal state.

Life is the sole arena for suffering and the nonexistent are incapable of experiencing suffering. Only by being created are you capable of suffering. Only by living are you susceptible to harm. Death provides safety from all suffering. Of course the process of dying can be painful but death, as the "state" (really it is the lack of a state) of nonexistence, isn't painful. A numerically plentiful minority of humans are fortunate enough to die without experiencing any pain in the process. However, the majority of humans and sentient beings in general experience a great deal of agony as they expire; which is why it's best to euthanize things as painlessly as possible rather than allow nature to take its course. It's best to carry out your own death at 30 than live through the agonies of becoming old and infirm or of dying through some other horrific means.

If we lived within a world comprised primarily of sensible people we would've agreed long ago that the best service that we can provide to anyone is a graceful exit from life without restriction. You can't determine for someone else whether or not they should continue their life. Obviously being able to walk into a clinic, sit in a chair and drift off into unconsciousness as you expire is the easiest, least painful and (in my opinion) most dignified way to die. No one should have to go through years of a painful existence due to various ailments because other people are afraid of death. No one should be legally obligated to continue a life that they feel isn't worthy of being lived because other people feel that they should.

So in summary there's no good justification for continuing life. It's not a rational decision and you can't accomplish anything. Even for those concerned solely with experiencing pleasure life is almost certainly not worth experiencing according to even your own standards as illustrated by the hypothetical in which you're obligated to experience all of the negative moments in an uninterrupted sequence in order to experience the pleasurable moments. Death is release from everything, there isn't anything beyond death; no pain, no deprivation, no loss, no addiction to stimulation.

One of the primary efilist positions is that humans need to recognize that existence inflicts a great deal of unnecessary harm upon not only ourselves as individuals or upon humanity collectively but upon innumerable sentient nonhuman animals as well. Humans aren't the primary cause of suffering and we're not the source of suffering. The reward and punishment systems that ancient fish evolved can't be magically erased. Probably all fish and certainly all tetrapods experience pain just as any human does. The reward and punishment systems far predate the divergence of tetrapods from our common ancestor. Humans aren't responsible for the infliction of most pain in any event so eliminating our own species for the sake of reducing nonhuman animal suffering is nonsensical and shows that you've failed to grasp the fundamental problem with sentience upon the Earth.

Just a brief disclaimer before I start talking about the suffering of other humans and of nonhuman animals; if you don't have any empathetic sentiments for other humans or for nonhuman animals then the following arguments won't hold much weight for you.

For fish, with our reward and punishment systems, the Earth is a battlefield. There are sources of pain everywhere.

Exposure to extreme temperatures, starvation, dehydration, sleep deprivation, fatigue, disease etc. are all common problems in the wilderness. Our reward and punishment systems have been selected to reward or punish us for interacting with everything we're likely to encounter which will either aid or harm our survival. Some say that life is meant for suffering but in truth suffering is meant for life, suffering has been calibrated for our existence upon Earth.

We're not capable of eliminating every source of pain for ourselves as individuals or for our species and we're certainly not capable of removing every source of pain in the wilderness. We might be capable of eliminating the experience of pain through neurological surgery for the entirety of our species at some point but given the fact that we're not capable of resolving a great number of simpler problems even within the most developed nations it's unlikely that said surgery will become widely and freely available after its development. We'll almost certainly never be capable of eliminating pain for nonhuman animals without killing them, especially since the sensation of pain is one of the primary mechanisms to ensure survival.

A qualitative difference exists between suffering and pleasure and that is that pleasure is highly subjective whereas particular sensations are certain to cause pain in all people; that is to say that you may enjoy a music album or a painting that I dislike but we'll both be in pain by being cut with a blade or having a limb crushed. Of course pain thresholds differ from person to person, the level of pain that people can tolerate differs, but pain isn't subjective like pleasure. Tissue damage (an example of nociceptive pain in which nociceptors at the ends of nerves send signals up the spinal column to the brain) induces pain in everyone (except those with congenital insensitivity to pain) even if different people have different levels of pain that they can endure.

Before I continue I'll respond to a common objection I can hear crawling through my mind as I type this. *"Why eliminate pain? Pain is a good thing because it keeps us alive!"* This is the objection most people would raise to what I've said thus far. The problem with this objection is that it assumes that remaining alive is within the best interest of the organism concerned. No, we don't have any good reason to assume that remaining alive is in the best interest of any organism and we certainly don't know (unless we can communicate with said organism) if the organism prefers to remain alive. Even an organism which would rather be dead may continue living due to their inherited and unconscious drive

to continue. For instance I would rather be dead but I continue living in spite of my knowledge that my life will in all likelihood be far more agonizing than I would like and that I certainly wouldn't relive my life given the aforesaid hypothetical in which all of my negative experiences are experienced sequentially and uninterrupted. We can reach rational conclusions and fail to act upon them. We're not perfectly rational beings who act according to our own best interest. Pain should be eliminated because it's definitionally bad, it's definitionally unpleasant for the experiencer. The extinction of certain species or even of all life is a small price to pay to extinguish suffering.

Life as a phenomena isn't accomplishing anything worth the price in suffering. So there's no good reason for the pain to be inflicted for however many more hundreds of millions of years the Earth will be capable of sustaining sentient organisms. Nothing we're doing makes up for the torture in the world; nothing makes up for the gazelles being ripped apart or the cows being shocked in tiny pens or for wolves starving to death or for sparrows freezing to death, human children being gang-raped and on and on.

Every organism is just unconsciously attempting to replicate their genome (or it could simply be an unconscious drive to have sex which is rewarded with an orgasm). Certain stimuli are pleasant only because they're useful to ensuring that the organism survives and procreates.

Our species is no different from any other, no different from even the most basic unicellular bacteria, in that we're simply attempting to replicate our genome. Of course we're sharp enough to invent some garbage stories, "meanings" and "purposes" to justify and aggrandize our poor decision to procreate but we're still playing the same stupid game as every other organism upon the Earth (the same stupid game of gene replication that even bacteria without any neurons are playing). We only really differ from less intelligent animals in that we're capable of manipulating and even of creating our own environment in order to ensure that our offspring are far more likely to survive than they would be within the wilderness.

Our higher level of average intelligence didn't come about for any reason other than environmental pressures existed which naturally selected for intelligence i.e. it was of benefit to our ancestors; and we're not doing anything with our greater intelligence but more efficiently replicate our genomes and create systems and technologies to aid us in that endeavor. Fundamentally we're still just thoughtlessly replicating ourselves like a mosquito, virus, rat or worm.

Really though you're not capable of replication or reproduction. The neurological characteristics, the "personality traits", that define you aren't going to be inherited in all likelihood. Some things, like propensity for violence, are heritable but your love for model ships or a particular piece of music or the work of a particular painter or style of painting etc. won't be inherited. The physical characteristics of our brains aren't determined solely by genetics. Our brain's structure and its interconnections are also determined by our experiences. Some of the more extreme and easy to point to examples are how various chemical dependencies alter our brains. Even if every detail of your brain was heritable and could be exactly copied your children wouldn't be "you" because through sexual reproduction they'll only inherit 50% of their genome from you and some portion of that won't be accurately copied due to mutation.

So you can't make it into the future; only your genome can and even then not even the full 50% after a single generation. There's no good reason to concern yourself with ensuring the replication of sequences of chemical compounds.

The absence of life isn't something that we lament. We consciously value existing organisms but few people are actually interested in ensuring that life is propagated in as many places as possible within the universe. Few people are really distraught that Mars is devoid of life or that Saturn is devoid of life. Furthermore very few people even lament the loss of potential life represented by the incalculable numbers of individual spermatozoon which fail to produce a new life each day or the countless eggs which are never fertilized. People aren't as concerned with the phenomena of life as they are the living organisms which already exist. There's no harm done by making Earth as "quiet", as devoid of life, as nearly every other celestial body throughout the cosmos.

Eliminating all sentient life (omnicide) is the solution that efilism proposes to eliminate and prevent all future suffering and here I will address alternative means of eliminating and preventing suffering. In my estimation there aren't any realistic alternative proposals. Bio-engineering pain out of organisms compromises their ability to survive and there's no guarantee that our work wouldn't be undone by evolution anyway; furthermore no one could suggest a means of bio-engineering deep sea life so that they no longer experience pain. Verifying that all sentient organisms are no longer capable of experiencing pain is also a ridiculous suggestion on the grounds that the labor force required to

initially verify and continually monitor this would be absurdly large and the equipment needed would probably occupy nearly the entirety of human industrial capacity. The same set of problems exist for sterilizing all life so that subsequent generations of sufferers cannot be born.

In any event assuming that we're capable of eliminating suffering without carrying out omnicide there's still an important question that should be answered. For what purpose are we preserving life? So that organisms can chase dopamine and serotonin releases? So that organisms may indulge in their chemical dependencies which exist only as a consequence of life? Addiction, even if you're averse to the term, is the sole reason you may articulate for preserving the phenomena of life. Even if pain is bio-engineered out of sentient organisms they're still leading a pointless existence; so we're back to the brains in dishes or vats scenario.

In no way is enacting omnicide a radical proposal in my view. All life will go extinct in any event, omnicide is an inevitability anyway; just as your death as an individual is an accomplished fact from the moment of your conception. As efilists we're simply proposing that we should carry it out soon rather than allow an unknown number of years of suffering to transpire for no good reason and for omnicide to happen as a consequence of natural forces. We can either make our best effort to painlessly eliminate all life or "mother nature" will gradually render Earth (and the entire universe assuming we can "save" some species from being destroyed along with the Earth) uninhabitable and the quality of life of all sentient species will deteriorate over time as the Earth dies (or as the universe becomes uninhabitable in the latter, unlikely, scenario). Do we need to allow hundreds of millions of years of suffering to transpire? What is accomplished by allowing it to transpire? Why should we allow all of that suffering to happen?

A common objection to carrying out omnicide is that it violates the consent of humans and or of nonhuman animals to which I'd respond that obviously nonhuman animals aren't capable of putting the pieces together as we are; they're not capable of reasoning and so they're not equipped to identify the cause of their problems or of identifying the optimal solution to their problems. Injured animals in the wild do everything within their power to continue their struggle for existence in spite of their suffering. With grievously wounded or terminally ill pets we conclude that it's in their best interest to end their suffering as painlessly as possible. That's all efilists are proposing ultimately: as

painless an end to the unwell condition of sentience as we can effect.

As regards humans of course it would be nice if we could convince everyone on Earth that the efilist position is correct and that the proposed solution is the best means of permanently and completely eliminating suffering upon the Earth but we're not going to be capable of convincing absolutely everyone. Some percentage of humanity will have their consent violated in order to enact omnicide. For the people who are determined to continue existing we could sterilize them and give them the option to exist in a nice bunker with all manner of entertainment available, we could even provide them a simulation of the world before omnicide was carried out with which to interact. There are graceful ways to carry omnicide out and minimize the distress which people who are opposed to the proposal will experience.

Another common objection is that suffering will be inflicted during our effort to carry out omnicide. It's a pretty weak objection because any suffering that we might inflict even over the course of two centuries will pale in comparison to the suffering that "mother nature" will inflict upon sentient organisms over the course of the next several hundred million years. We could dedicate nearly our entire industrial capacity and most of our labor force to torturing other animals for ten million years and it still wouldn't be a drop in the bucket compared to the suffering that absolutely will transpire unless we prevent it by eliminating all sentient organisms. There's no scenario in which the infliction of omnicide produces even a hundredth of the suffering that will happen if we don't inflict it and instead allow the horrors of nature to continue and for the sun to cook the Earth and render it completely uninhabitable within a billion years.

All suffering is a shame, it sucks and it's tragic that we exist within this condition and yes it's sad that we'll probably have to inflict some degree of pain in order to permanently extinguish pain but if you've got to break two legs in order to prevent the breaking of tens of thousands of legs it's a small price to pay. As regards carrying out omnicide it's not going to be easy on the conscience. I wish that suffering could be eliminated without carrying out omnicide. I love animals, I love watching them and feeding them (squirrels especially); I wish that omnicide wasn't the best and really only means of eliminating suffering. I really wish that weren't true but it is. Our reality is cruel and sad, our condition as sentient beings is cruel and sad.

Some will argue that eliminating all currently sentient beings won't prevent sentience from evolving again from whatever organisms are left. The time required for sentience to evolve again from whatever microbes survive our deployment of various means to eliminate sentient life would be too great for sentience to evolve again before the world becomes uninhabitable for complex life. However, if people are concerned about that possibility we can simply do a more thorough job and pollute the world so that the timeframe within which sentience may evolve again is shrunk. Complex life only has about a billion years maximum left upon this planet so there's little risk of sentience developing again after it's eliminated.

To elaborate upon the aforesaid: sentience was naturally selected for because it provided a survival advantage to organisms obliged to move around in order to secure nutrition. Sentience strengthens fitness (for survival) by disincentivizing ambulatory organisms from interacting with things which threaten their physical integrity and by incentivizing them to consume food and reproduce. Obviously a sedentary organism couldn't benefit from sentience because they're not navigating various environs; they don't benefit from the pleasure-pain reward-punishment system because they're exposed to far fewer threats to their survival and because they're not capable of reacting to those threats in any event. A plant isn't moving around exposing itself to different environmental hazards and if something does come to destroy the plant it's incapable of escape anyway so sentience does nothing to improve its odds of surviving and thus procreating. For ambulatory organisms nothing could be more important to ensuring that it survives long enough to procreate than to prevent said organisms from inadvertently killing themselves due to exposure to toxins or temperature extremes; pain also helps sentient organisms avoid being consumed by predators. Reward systems, providing organisms with addictions, also help organisms survive by providing a chemical motivation for completing certain tasks essential for surviving and then reproducing.

Sentience developed within ambulatory organisms descended from eukaryotes that predated upon photosynthetic eukaryotes. All eukaryotes share a common photosynthetic ancestor and the ancestors of sentient beings were cannibalistic eukaryotes who no longer needed to produce their own energy thanks to their ability to consume their cousins; this cannibalistic consumption (which began about 1.7 to 2 billion years ago) was the beginning of the biological arms race that lead to the development of sentience (which arose around at least 540

million years ago).

In a billion years or so the Earth will be too hot for photosynthesis to occur; this will obviously lead to omnicide because photosynthetic organisms are the sole producers of bio-available nutrients. Every other organism is dependent upon photosynthetic organisms (primarily plants obviously) to produce nutrients from solar energy in order for those nutrients to be bio-available. All of these facts should be readily apparent to anyone with even a rudimentary understanding of how a food chain works but I'm throwing this in here anyway. Once photosynthetic organisms disappear there won't be any food. Omnicide is guaranteed once photosynthesis becomes impossible.

No one wants to consider the repercussions of actions which they unconsciously undertake, especially those which are societally accepted and most especially those which are encouraged. However, no one can be excused for failing to consider the ramifications of bringing a new being into existence, for it is truly the most consequential decision you can make for another person.

Yet the majority of people intend to have children purely for their own gratification. Some people will wait until they're in a better financial position before they procreate and a tiny minority will consider the potential health problems from which their offspring may suffer and get screened for heritable ailments at a doctor's office but the majority of people have children without regard for even these most basic quality of life considerations on behalf of their children. However there are problems more pervasive and insoluble than the socio-economic class into which you're born or the diseases to which you're more susceptible or have inherited though these problems are themselves extremely aggravating in innumerable cases****.

Aside from endless toil for the capitalist class and illness (which are horrific enough) there is also the strong possibility that for some reason your children may never experience prolonged happiness or even contentment. It could be due to a brain deformity, it could be due to their upbringing, it could be due to chemical imbalances or just a general dissatisfaction with the state of the world. You're incapable of guaranteeing the happiness of others and happiness isn't a voluntary state; just as belief is involuntary. No one can force themselves to be happy with anything in particular; new information or a new perspective can compel belief and or compel satisfaction with the current state of affairs but no one can will themselves into

believing or being contented with anything. There are extremely wealthy people in psychological turmoil and there are impoverished people who are overjoyed to be alive and vice versa.

Ignoring the issue of happiness and assuming you're capable of meeting every material demand your child or children may make of the world there is still the issue of harm inflicted upon them by the world at large. You're incapable of preventing your children from being kidnapped, raped, tortured, murdered, eaten or from experiencing severe psychological distress from any number of life circumstances. Some people are so easily traumatized that life is in and of itself agonizing as it is the medium for repeated traumatization.

Only by being brought into the world are you capable of knowing deprivation; nonexistent potential entities aren't missing out on anything and there's no good argument in favor of rolling the dice with innumerable potential torments for the sake of potential benefits which the being may not even appreciate anyway. Potential parents can argue that A, B and C make up for the horror of the average dying experience but you can't guarantee that the death of your offspring won't be significantly worse than average or that their life in general won't be agonizing. Obviously parents can't guarantee access to A, B and C or that their offspring will find anything in life that makes the suffering worth experiencing. Furthermore the fact that someone is convinced that their life is alright and that the hardships are worth enduring doesn't justify the imposition of creating them with which to begin. No one is capable of consenting to being created. In the best case scenario life is an unnecessary imposition and nothing more. In the worst case scenario life is a nightmare.

Many will say that life objectively possesses intrinsic value. Well from the atheist perspective it's incapable of objectively having intrinsic value and in fact the concept of objective value is itself contradictory. All value is generated by the brain and is subjectively determined. All values are subjective whether we're talking about the value of a vehicle, the value of your life, a sandwich, a home, a philosophical concept etc. Nothing possesses objective value and as such is incapable of objectively possessing intrinsic value. As demonstrated earlier life doesn't possess intrinsic positive value even from the perspective of the experiencer. To reiterate, if life possessed intrinsic positive value suicide wouldn't occur because no matter how bad a particular set of circumstances may be life would be worthy of

continuing after making minor lifestyle changes.

Nihilism is just factually true as far as I can discern. To be a nihilist is to acknowledge the reality that within our universe nothing possesses or is even capable of possessing an objective meaning, purpose or value. If you're an atheist you already accept that our universe is not a creation, if you're an atheist you already accept that our universe and the events which take place within it lack objective meaning or purpose. So nihilist isn't a significant term in the context of discussions between atheists.

Atheism is the null hypothesis, atheism is the neutral position which presupposes nothing. It is the reasonable position to maintain until evidence proves the existence of a god or of supernatural forces. I go so far as to say that convicted, strong, atheism (anti-theism) is a rational position.

Nihilism is another null hypothesis, another neutral position. There's no justification for accepting that any values are objective until they're proven as such. There's no justification for accepting that life possesses objective meaning until its proven in some way.

As a brief aside I want to touch upon modern usage of the term nihilist. The term has really just become a pejorative for anyone who says something you dislike that feels pessimistic or defeatist. However nihilism has a proper meaning and all atheists are nihilists irrespective of their distaste for being labeled as such.

As I see it, in order for a value or moral or ethical or philosophical stance to be objectively true it must be physically incontrovertible: i.e. it must be inviolable as a consequence of natural (physical) laws. Obviously there aren't any moral, ethical or philosophical principles which are impossible to transgress. What else could it mean for a moral, ethical or philosophical statement to be objective?

In what way is the claim that murder is wrong objective? In what way is it factual? What does it actually say about the reality in which we exist? What physical laws are described by this moral or ethical "fact"? In order for a claim to be factual it needs to be descriptive, it needs to say something verifiable and falsifiable about reality. Prescriptive statements are, definitionally, incapable of being objective (factual) as they're claims about how things "should" be when obviously our universe shouldn't be in any particular configuration; whatever configuration our universe "should" be in is the one dictated by natural law. The universe is always as it "ought" to be, that is to say that "ought" is a meaningless term as regards the universe because the physical

laws and causal chain of events which have lead to the current state of affairs are completely indifferent to any human conception of how things should be arranged. The universe makes no adjustments on account of human sentiment. There cannot be objective or factual moral or ethical claims and philosophical claims could only be regarded as factual insofar as they're a description of reality and not some vague insane nonsense about spirits. For the sake of argument let's pretend as though there are moral or ethical facts within our reality. How would that be established? How would you distinguish a universe in which "objective" morals or ethics exist from one in which they don't if these "objective" ought claims are capable of being transgressed?

Some atheists will state that certain actions and experiences are objectively wrong or bad but for the aforesaid reasons I feel as though they're misusing the term objective. Gary "Inmendham" (who I respect greatly, he's undeniably an extremely sharp individual) will say that negative value (a distressing neurological state) is objectively bad. I agree that the sufferers would universally agree that pain is bad, it's an obviously correct statement since pain is definitionally bad; what is pain if not bad and what is bad if not painful or distressing. However, the universality of an opinion or experience doesn't make it objectively true that the opinion or even actual experience is good or bad.

All of this might be regarded as a trivial semantic point but I don't feel as though using the term objective provides any benefit when presenting the efilist arguments. Yes, pain objectively exists, yes, pain is definitionally and universally experienced as bad but it isn't objectively bad i.e. it isn't a violation of any physical laws. Nothing can be objectively good or bad, these are value statements subjectively generated by brains. Again suffering, pain, distress objectively exist but it isn't a fact that anything that we regard as bad is objectively so. There are no moral or ethical facts; no prescriptive statements, no oughts, which are factual. It isn't a fact, it isn't an accurate description of reality, to state that X is wrong. Nothing is capable of being "wrong" in the universe in an objective sense. If it exists it's natural and it could only be described as good or bad by sentient beings. Again all of this might simply be a trivial semantic point but I feel like it matters a bit.

Another objection raised against the proposal to enact omnicide is that life is natural, that living things have an

inborn natural desire to continue living and some will even argue that whatever happens within the universe is inherently good. All of these arguments are fallacious; all of them are, without good cause, appealing to nature in their assessment of the sentient condition.

Appealing to nature really says nothing because everything that has ever existed, that currently exists, that will ever exist and that could possibly exist are natural. Definitionally, if it's physically possible it obeys natural law, it is natural. To appeal to nature (and be consistent anyway) is to be apathetic, it's to say that you're unconcerned with suffering in all of its forms because they're physically possible; because they're natural. An appeal to nature can be used to justify chaining someone up and torturing them, cannibalism, rape, mass murder etc. By appealing to nature you're just wasting your time, you're not saying anything substantive unless you actually mean you're okay with anything and everything horrific that happens; in which case instead of appealing to nature you may as well just state that you're a sociopath who is unconcerned with the suffering in the universe.

Some will object that there's no good reason for any stance, no good justifications for any philosophical positions. That all prescriptions, being merely opinions, are equally invalid. While I'm willing to acknowledge that no prescription is factual (i.e. it isn't a fact that anything in particular ought to be done about anything), I reject that all perspectives are of equivalent validity on the grounds that many perspectives (such as theistic perspectives) are polluted with nonsense and are consequently incapable of accurately describing reality. Before what could even be colloquially regarded as a valid opinion upon a subject can be formed the relevant facts have to be identified, understood and accurately stated. All supernatural belief systems obviously fail to accurately describe life and the problem with most atheists is that they fail to consider the fact that nonhuman animals are suffering.

Efilism is one of the only philosophies to accurately describe the important facts about the condition of sentience. Of course some people will say that what constitutes an important fact can be disputed endlessly to which I'd respond that's quite ridiculous. You, like all sentient beings, value your own neurological state more than anything. So it's obvious that a perspective formulated by sentient beings must reckon primarily with sentient well-being. Pleasure and pain are real and there's nothing more

important than suffering. There's nothing that justifies all of the suffering in the world; so there aren't too many things that are really important. The story you want to tell yourself so you can overlook the suffering, the "meaning" you inject into life, isn't a relevant fact; it's a delusion.

As efilists we're not interested in endless word games, endless descriptions of human invented abstractions or in aggrandizing ourselves or in making light of or attempting to excuse the suffering in the world. We're interested in an accurate description of reality and in fixing problems.

I feel confident in saying that there aren't any factual inaccuracies in the efilist perspective and there aren't any relevant facts that we've failed to consider. As a species we understand the condition of sentient beings and there aren't any discoveries that will justify the suffering. The only "leap" that exists within efilism, the only "ought", is that we should permanently end suffering upon the Earth by perpetrating omnicide. The only opinion is that we need to utilize the most effective means to painlessly and permanently extinguish suffering through omnicide.

Suffering is definitionally and universally bad, that's the only real justification I feel is required to argue for its alleviation. Of course if you're a sociopath, if you lack empathy, the suffering doesn't matter. To me it doesn't matter that suffering isn't "objectively" bad; it's an irrelevant objection to the efilist position because nothing is objectively good or bad. Suffering objectively exists even if said fact isn't in and of itself objectively good or bad. Suffering is real and it's universally accepted by all but sociopaths and the insane that it should be alleviated. Some people will say that suffering is good or at least acceptable if it "accomplishes" something but as I covered earlier the things that we deem victories or accomplishments are impermanent and thus ultimately futile; there is no goal that justifies the infliction of suffering except the prevention of more severe suffering in the future. If you're going to defend the infliction of suffering for your own benefit or for the sake of some religious dogma or for the sake of some other deluded notion you've got floating around your mind then you're an asshole.

Some will say that we can opt for an incomplete solution, that we could eliminate certain species or all nonhuman animals but an incomplete "solution" is inherently suboptimal. As stated previously there's simply no point in maintaining the phenomena of life so an incomplete solution would only appeal to and be suggested by those who feel that

there’s something in reality worth experiencing, in other words, they’re incapable of overcoming their addiction to neuro-chemical stimulation. Yeah we could maybe create a world in which herbivores are running around consuming plants undisturbed by carnivores and maybe we could try to alleviate some of their environmental hardships too (I don’t think that we could practically do so but I’ll concede the possibility for the sake of argument) but what’s the point in having animals running around consuming, defecating and reproducing like the biological machines that they are? Again if we’re interested in maximizing happiness I refer you to the hypothetical posed upon pages 36-37.

Some efilists and other proponents of extinguishing sentience will argue that our species needs to continue until we’re capable of developing means of eliminating sentient life in other parts of the cosmos. To this I would say that there are real, hard, limits to the technical capabilities which we may develop. We’re not going to be traveling faster than light for instance, we’re not going to develop a means of endlessly generating energy from nothing. There are incontrovertible laws of physics, our universe is configured in a particular way as a consequence of the fundamental nature of particles and of their interactions. I’m not convinced that we’re ever going to be capable of developing a spaceship which can survive a multi-million year journey through outer space. For the sake of argument let’s ignore the integrity of the vessel and how we would repair anything that goes wrong with the exterior or how we would source new raw materials for parts for instance. How are we going to provide enough energy and clean water for however many humans for however many millions of years until our destination is reached? Even if these issues are somehow resolved how are we going to transport the means, the equipment, to carry out omnicide on however many different celestial bodies over the course of however many billions, trillions, quadrillions or even quintillions of years? Furthermore how would you even ensure that the mission would be agreeable to however many innumerable future generations?

You could argue that we could construct an artificial intelligence or extremely sophisticated computer program to carry out omnicide throughout the universe but I don’t believe that the resources exist to travel the necessary distance and then carry out omnicide and I don’t think anything could be designed to survive the voyage. Sentience, the capacity to experience pain, is a problem that requires local solutions due to the scale of the cosmos. It’s not wise

to continue sentient suffering upon the Earth in the deluded hope that we'll be capable of developing the means to extinguish suffering in other galaxies. Best case scenario we could eliminate sentience on other celestial bodies within our solar system and I would agree that propagating our species for a short time is acceptable if time is required to develop the means to carry out omnicide on Neptune for example.

A lot of optimists, a lot of life-affirmers, will openly say that instrumentalizing suffering is fine by saying things like "the sacrifices of previous generations are being made good on by ourselves". Only a person that feels that life is good and that suffering is acceptable could claim that the sacrifices of previous generations are even capable of being "made good on" or of being "paid off". What are we doing that's really making up for over 500 million years of suffering? Even if we're solely concerned with human suffering what are we doing, what have we done, what could we ever do, that would make up for the millions of annual deaths from starvation and dehydration, for the millions of agonizing crucifixions, for millions of horrific deaths and disfigurements from shrapnel bombs, for the billions who have lived and died as property, for the absolutely appalling number and percentage of women who have been sexually raped and are being sexually raped every year even now, for all of the deaths by fire, for all of the horrific deaths and disfigurements from machinery, all of the people cut to pieces by swords, knives and bayonets etc.

Pleasure is the only thing you could really list off that might justify the instrumentalization of suffering (because as explained earlier all goals are futile) and if pleasure is sufficient justification for the instrumentalization of suffering then we could justify kidnapping, imprisoning, enslaving and raping people on the grounds that the beneficiary is "experiencing more pleasure" than the sufferer and therefore the suffering is "being made up for" or "generating a profit" in terms of happiness. Some may object that kidnapping, imprisonment and rape aren't justified even if they do produce a "profit" in pleasure versus the cost in suffering because it's a violation of the victim's right to consent or right to freedom of movement etc. but if we're going to appeal to a value, to be consistent, the principle ought to be applied universally and we can conclude that reproduction is wrong because of the consent violation and violation of one's right to move freely (because all children are going to be forced to go to various places they don't

want to go and do things that they're not inclined to do by their legal guardians, whether these guardians are their parents, aunt, grandmother, adopted parent etc.). In fact we could also talk about the violation of one's rights (whatever rights most people would agree exist or should exist) as an adult also because the vast majority of adults are obligated to work which in and of itself provides us with a treasure trove of examples of consent violation.

We're the only species of animal upon the Earth that's capable of significantly instrumentalizing suffering in any event. For nonhuman animals all of the suffering of previous generations hasn't enabled them to do anything to improve their standards of living i.e. to prevent suffering. Human construction workers destroying their backs over the course of 30 years through the completion of different important projects does prevent future suffering. The suffering of doctors who have developed various vaccines has prevented several orders of magnitude more suffering. No suffering of any nonhuman animal is doing anything to prevent their great-grandchildren from suffering. A rabbit might get ripped apart by a coyote and prevent their children from being killed in the process but that sacrifice won't do anything to prevent their grandchildren or great-grandchildren from suffering in various ways. We're the only species capable of taking actions which might prevent future suffering altogether.

As Inmendham points out even solutions to problems, solutions which reduce suffering in the short-term, may create more suffering than would've occurred otherwise because the solution ends up increasing the total population. So instead of whatever number of people dying from horrific ailments they'll procreate new sufferers. So even solutions to problems, though they reduce short-term suffering, aren't guaranteed to produce a net decrease in suffering in the long-term. We could save millions a year from starvation but in the process we're just enabling them to suffer for a longer period of time from various other sources and to go on to create new sufferers through procreating.

In an absolute sense death is the sole means of reducing suffering because it reduces the ability for suffering to occur whereas the elimination of sources of suffering only limits how suffering may be inflicted. As covered earlier (on page 45-46) we could hypothetically eliminate all suffering for humanity through bioengineering (through gene editing or brain surgery or some other solution) but there's no realistic means of carrying out an equivalent solution for all sentient nonhuman animals. Only death offers salvation from suffering.

The pathologization of people who are dissatisfied with existence is pretty intellectually lazy and dishonest from my perspective. To me it's akin to saying that because the majority are satisfied with a particular amusement park that you must be unwell if you're dissatisfied with said park. No, I don't need to be unwell to be dissatisfied with the park. I may have several perfectly valid reasons to be dissatisfied with the park that you'll never hear because you're blocking out everything that's being said and writing it all off as the "ravings of a madman". If you'd pay attention to the arguments and objectively analyze the world you'd realize that Inmendham has accurately assessed reality.

I feel that people who are totally fine with all of the suffering in the world and who feel that it should be continued are the one's who are unwell. In my view if you're opposed to omnicide you're mentally unwell because to oppose a permanent and complete solution to suffering you're essentially saying that it's fine that people are bed-ridden their entire lives, it's fine that little birds are slowly killed by spiders, it's fine that people destroy their bodies slaving away to support themselves, it's fine that komodo dragons might be cannibalized by their parents or siblings, it's fine that elk get ripped apart by wolves and it's fine that you might die in an agonizing and protracted way.

In what way would a sane person feel that the suffering within the world is an acceptable price to pay for anything? What makes it worth it? I just find it amusing that these sadists want to label efilists or people dissatisfied with life in general as mentally unwell. If anyone is deserving of the appellation mentally unwell it's people who excuse or ignore the torment of others. The majority of humanity would be appalled if any human were treated even remotely as poorly as animals within factory farms yet few care about the nonhuman animals because they're sadistic fucks who justify it with some sick garbage like "meat tastes good".

I love the "I like meat" argument that stupid and sociopathic people make to justify the torture and slaughter of animals. By that logic I could justify kidnapping, chaining up and raping women or driving nails into them because I like sex or I like the sounds of human screams etc. If your personal satisfaction is all that matters then anything could be justified. Most people can't even identify how fucked up and sociopathic they are.

People want to frame this as though individuals who identify problems with the world are unwell, as though these individuals have a personal problem that requires resolution. Arguably everyone has some psychological defects that could

be ironed out but what will resolving my personal issues do to alleviate the suffering in the world (which would take thousands of pages to list off if we got into the details)?

If efilists are unwell for identifying and being upset about the problem with the sentient condition we could level the accusation of poor mental health at slavery abolitionists, women's suffragettes, vegans, communists etc. I suppose to be mentally well you're just supposed to be a mindless drone that accepts whatever values the education system, media and other facets of society intend to propagandize you with. Don't question the cultural norms and certainly don't implicate that there could be something wrong with the natural condition of sentience or you're mentally ill. It is funny in a way because humanity has always initially rejected every movement that has attempted to alleviate suffering or ensure that there's at least a more level playing field for different segments of the population. Contemporaneous critics of slavery abolitionists and women's suffragettes (slavery apologists and misogynists) did in fact refer to them as mentally ill and today's critics of veganism, communism and efilism (meat addicts, wageslavery apologists and sociopaths) refer to proponents of all three positions as mentally ill because they're incapable of addressing the arguments.

Opponents of veganism, communism and efilism aren't capable of identifying the factual inaccuracy in the descriptions of the world offered by these positions so they've got to terminate thought, shut down discussion, by labeling proponents of the aforesaid positions as mentally ill. It's just classic ad hominem through pathologization. There's no factual inaccuracy in the statement that plenty of nonhuman animals experience pain and therefore it's sadistic to enslave, rape, torture, imprison and slaughter them for consumption. There's no factual inaccuracy in the statement that the history of civilization is a history of owning classes exploiting the working classes. There's no factual inaccuracy in the statement that omnicide is the sole means of permanently and completely eliminating and preventing all suffering. If you're serious about opposing a philosophical position you need to address the arguments not the espousers.

To summarize, so that all of this really sticks, the only things we're living for, ultimately, are positive neurological sensations (and those sensations exist solely to motivate you to continue living and to procreate). Those "positive" sensations can really best be described as the alleviation of a negative, unwell, state (because at the very

least we'll suffer from boredom without some sort of stimulation). All that really matters is our neurological state; what matters is whether or not we're entertained, satiated, in pain, fearful etc. Pleasure and pain are positive and negative value, they're what we're trying to seek and avoid; other things are "valuable" only insofar as they're instrumental in avoiding pain or achieving "pleasure" (which, to reiterate, is really the alleviation of pain). No quantity of gold is of utility unless it alleviates suffering. Every resource and energy expenditure really goes towards the alleviation of suffering, either directly or indirectly; even if the alleviation is for the exclusive benefit of one person, one class or one species at the expense of another. That there are no true positive values is what makes life a zero-sum game. Suffering is the money we're really playing with, life isn't a single player game and it's too expensive. Even if we were to acknowledge the positives as truly positive (as something other than mere alleviation of a negative) the price is still too exorbitant to justify.

Nothing that humanity has done will ever pay off the suffering of just the first world war or even 30 years of wild animal suffering. If you're stupid or a sociopath you can make light of suffering but it's what actually matters to the sufferers. Your own suffering matters to you, the suffering of others matters to themselves. Nonhuman animals don't want to be tormented just as you don't want to be tormented; you're not special because you're a bit more intelligent and capable of comprehending written language. All suffering matters.

The story of life is the story of need machines unconsciously attempting to fulfill those needs so that their genome will be replicated and carried into the future. It's a story of unfeeling machines cannibalistically consuming their relatives and the biological warfare that is natural selection eventually producing a brain which then eventually fabricated value in order to motivate organisms so as to improve their odds of survival; all of this of course being an unintended and blind process produced by physical laws. The unintended (but beneficial and thus selected for) fabrication of value by brains, the ability to experience pleasure and pain, was the beginning of pleasure and suffering. The last 540 or so million years of the story of life on Earth has largely been feeling need machines being tormented and rewarded by chemicals released in their brains. It's been at least 540 million years of discomfort, hunger, exhaustion and pain. It's been 540 million years of animals ripping one another apart so that the "winner's" genome will

be propagated, it's been 540 million years of a nightmare to accomplish nothing. 540 million years of babies being smashed and torn apart, 540 million years of unimaginable suffering.

As Inmendham says it's sad and pathetic that most people are so blinded by bullshit that they're incapable of realizing what life really is. We tell ourselves it's all fine because we're entranced by the beauty of plants or nonhuman animals or because some garbage holy book says all the suffering is fine or because we're stupid and sociopathic enough to tell ourselves that the suffering is alright because "it's natural". The majority of humanity has no appreciation for the fact that our ability to discern the truth about the history of life and of sentience came at the price of hundreds of millions of years of agony on the part of an incalculable number of animals who were thrown into this warzone by their parents without their consent because all animals are mindlessly obeying their programmed desire to have sex so that the chemical combination that is the genome can continue into the future. All of this suffering is instrumental to the replication of some chemical combinations.

It's so insidious, so pointless and so horrific for the beings who are imprisoned within their own bodies; subject to their inherited biological programming, essentially a slave to an uncaring process of natural selection. A process which has all pain enabled beings as its victims, as its playthings. The majority die so that a tiny minority of "victors" can have their genes replicated and consequently propagate more agony; so that the cycle of torment can continue until the genome (for whatever reason) can no longer be copied.

Humans, with our ability to identify these facts and overcome our base biological urges, should feel compelled to alleviate this suffering but most can't even see sentience for what it is: a curse, a burden blindly imposed. Being pain enabled changes everything about life. It doesn't really matter if unfeeling machines destroy one another, there's no suffering in that scenario. Introducing pain into the equation obviously changes everything. Those who claim that they're not interested in the pain and suffering of others wouldn't want to go through the worst example of a human life or want to live through even the average animal life. Even if you're not emotionally compelled to alleviate the suffering you should still be capable of rationally identifying that alleviating the suffering is in the interest of the sufferers, including yourself.

In regards to people who are interested in alleviating human suffering but not the suffering of other animals: you're just genetic supremacists really, you're just speciesists. That the suffering of some organisms matters less because they're intellectually inferior to yourself or because they're not closely related enough to yourself to belong to your "group" is the same exact argument that racial supremacists have always used to justify tormenting those belonging to other ethnicities. Speciesism is the same sociopathy, it's the same idiocy, as racism.

As a species we don't want to acknowledge the suffering of nonhuman animals for several reasons. We don't want to acknowledge the pain that we've inflicted and continue to inflict in order to satisfy our addiction to the taste and texture of meat (both of which can easily be substituted nowadays) and we don't want to acknowledge the suffering in the wilderness. We're a species that avoids responsibility, we cook up excuses and justifications for atrocities we perpetrate so that we don't feel obligated to make changes that disrupt the status quo i.e. changes that impact our comfort.

We don't want to end suffering because we see the suffering of others as an acceptable price in order to satisfy our addiction to pleasant sensations. We'll stand on the mountain of corpses of people who've died in the worst ways, we'll stand on the mountain of nonhuman animal corpses and say it was worth it because we're going to accomplish X and the more sociopathic will simply state that the suffering of others is not their own. Normal people typically have to invent some story or some goal to justify the torment that has been and is currently being inflicted. They'll talk about human progress or how we'll eventually alleviate wild animal suffering somehow or how suffering is fine because it's enabled others to lead "great" lives. We're fine with sacrificing others so long as we remain comfortable. We're fine with exploiting others so long as we remain comfortable; the history of civilization is class history i.e. the history of exploitation of man and nonhuman animal by the rulers of society. There have been billions who have parasitically existed off of the suffering of others throughout the history of humanity.

As a species it's time that we stopped being assholes who justify or excuse the suffering of others, especially when we've benefited or stand to benefit from it; suffering is inexcusable and unacceptable. It's time we quit pretending as though the condition of sentience is fine. It's time we quit being so selfish and stupid. It's time we quit pointlessly

attempting to satisfy our addictions. It’s time we identify nature for what it is and realize that the best thing that we can do for ourselves and for our fellow sufferers, for our relatives, is end the struggle with as little pain inflicted in the process as possible.

Notes:

* But not a random one, a machine with full knowledge of every possible particle interaction and the initial arrangement of said particles could predict the evolution of intelligence.

** How many people consider the potential harm in unnecessary operation of an automobile until they’re involved in a major accident?

*** Zoochosis is the medical term for animals displaying odd behaviors within zoos which is a consequence of lack of stimulation.

**** How many children have lived short miserable lives? How many children have died from illness, starvation and dehydration? How many people have toiled until they died without the means to enjoy respite? Heritable ailments (and susceptibilities to ailments) and financial hardship are extremely aggravating and produce an insane amount of misery.

Chapter III: Challenges Facing Human Development

This section is for all of the optimists who feel that prolonging our species is a worthwhile endeavor in spite of all the arguments presented thus far. Optimists will say that we should look beyond the miseries of the past and that we should endure the present hardships so that humans of the future can enjoy a better life.

It would be easy to dismiss hope for the future as delusional but many are convinced that we'll be capable of eliminating most if not all of our woes through technological advancement; and this is an understandable position given what has been accomplished within a few centuries of the industrial revolution. Therefore the hope that we can ameliorate and eliminate the primary causes of suffering deserves a more serious and thorough consideration and response. First I'll touch upon whether or not technology can solve the problems we face as a consequence of inhuman natural forces.

One of the biggest problems which I doubt we'll resolve without exacting a great toll in suffering is food production. The population grows but the quantity of land suitable for cultivation or grazing shrinks due to desertification and the quality of lands currently under cultivation worsens as we deplete the soil of nutrients as a consequence of industrialized cultivation practices and technology. There are several potential solutions to this problem. We can either change our agricultural practices and adopt less efficient but more sustainable methods which would require that we either utilize more land to maintain the current population or that we reduce the population without expanding the quantity of land under cultivation. Of course we could also formulate new chemicals which don't create the problems that existing chemicals do.

What I feel will be the most effective solution (assuming you're interested in maximizing the human population) to the problem of food insecurity is the elimination of meat production and the adoption of a vegan diet by the majority or preferably the entirety of the human population. Meat production is extremely inefficient at providing calories for human consumption. At least one third of the calories consumed by animals reared for consumption are lost in the conversion to flesh and bone. Cattle raising worsens soil quality because the heavy animals compact soil which is one

of the primary causes of soil erosion as many plants can no longer take root in the denser soil. The soil being denser and thus less porous also prevents carbon sequestration which obviously worsens our climate for human habitation.

Eliminating food insecurity is an insurmountable problem due to our unwillingness to change our behavior in order to enact the necessary solutions. The population will continue to grow, most will continue to consume animal products and the most widely used agricultural practices will always be those which generate the greatest profit without regard for their impact upon long-term sustainability. Over the course of centuries our species may become wise enough to limit population growth, end the consumption of animal products and move beyond seeing all productive activity as a means of generating money. However, we don't have centuries for social consciousness to develop to the level needed to adopt these positions. Desertification (caused primarily by the depletion of soil nutrients and erosion from industrial farming) is a pressing issue which needs to be addressed today in order to prevent the starvation of billions within a century. We can't develop and implement solutions to such fundamental problems (which exist upon an international scale) overnight.

Two things that require practically no effort on the part of people within developed nations which would serve to eliminate a great deal of hunger and which could be carried out immediately aren't being undertaken because the will to do so isn't there. To eliminate and prevent a great deal of hunger around the world all that would need to be done is to prevent over-consumption and waste of food through improper storage, it being sent to where it isn't needed and simply stupid disposal. The fact that most people aren't considerate enough of the suffering of others from starvation to prevent themselves from over-eating or stupidly disposing of food indicates that we certainly won't implement sensible measures to prevent future suffering from the aforesaid causes which endanger future food production.

Averting future food production crises requires modification in the mode of production and in the diets of individuals. To put it bluntly our lack of regard for the long-term implications of our agricultural practices and the foods which we choose to eat place a far lower limit on the number of people the Earth can sustain and in fact our choices are placing so great a strain upon the soil that we will desertify much of the Earth if we continue.

As stated it isn't a matter of whether or not people could be made aware of the gravity of the situation it's a matter of whether or not action can be taken to avert disaster

before the infliction of irreparable damage. I'm unconvinced that we'll avert disaster especially with so many who welcome disaster as a sign of the abrahamic end of days.

Regardless of how efficiently we produce food there are hard limits, the Earth does have a maximum carrying capacity. The aforesaid efficiency problems are a product of human stupidity and short-sightedness but fundamentally food production is a natural problem not a human created problem. Our planet is only so large, it receives only so much sunlight and only so much energy from sunlight is even capable of being utilized by plants (about 1-5%) etc.

Earth is projected to run out of natural gas and petroleum deposits which require less energy to extract than would be generated by burning those fuels by around the year 2070; the same is true for coal around 2150. Only a handful of the most developed nations are even preparing for a future in which we've run out of fossil fuels. Switching all of the equipment on Earth over to electric, especially by this deadline isn't feasible. Best case scenario we might successfully switch over all of the infrastructure within developed nations whilst attempting to minimize the negative repercussions in underdeveloped nations. Realistically we don't have enough of the specific metals and minerals required to manufacture all of the equipment (including batteries which often require rare metals and minerals) required to transition to a world independent of fossil fuels.

Sure we've got enough ores of various compositions to generate enough nuclear energy to power civilization for billions of years and it is technically true that metals and minerals can be recycled indefinitely but it's a really a matter of how many people we intend to sustain with the resources we have. We could recycle the same 10 trillion tons of steel indefinitely but if we need 40 trillion to complete the infrastructure required for the projected population then we've hit a real limit upon human growth without lowering standards of living or developing alternative materials.

I'm sure novel solutions to material scarcity will come about, I'm sure we'll synthesize new materials in order to satisfy people's needs but absolute limits exist. The Earth doesn't contain an infinite quantity of any material. I can't tell you what material it will be that we'll have an insufficient quantity of to produce whatever is required but shortages will exist; especially if we intend to increase the human population to 20 billion or more.

The most insurmountable inhuman "natural" (of course

everything is natural in an ultimate sense) problem is that the Earth is going to warm to such a high degree within a billion years that photosynthesis will no longer be possible. The only realistic solution to that problem is to abandon Earth and attempt to colonize some other world but it's not a realistic proposal in my opinion. You could list off the probably insurmountable technical problems facing space colonization (or just extreme distance space travel in general) all day. To start with I'm not convinced that we could ever construct a craft that could survive a journey of several hundred thousand years and be capable of sustaining the lives of the passengers. How would we produce enough water? How would we procure raw materials needed to repair critical systems? How would you guarantee that no catastrophic failures occur over the course of at least tens of thousands of years? Once you arrive somewhere how will you actually begin and carry out the process of making the moon or planet habitable? Will we even have enough energy to reach and then terraform (make it similar to Earth in terms of conditions) a place which could actually be terraformed? Just for reference the closest solar system to our own, Alpha Centauri, is 25 trillion miles away.

There aren't many problems that you could say are caused exclusively by human behavior. The problems listed above are largely a consequence of factors outside of our control but the problems I'm about to address really are of our own making.

Waste and misallocation of the Earth's finite resources is a major problem. Every resource we've got is finite in an absolute sense and obviously many are scarce in proportion to the demand which they're intended to satiate. Obviously food and clean freshwater are good examples of resources which are scarce due primarily to waste, misallocation and inefficient production. No exact figures exist but estimates say that at least a billion tonnes of food go to waste every year as of 2020. The World Health Organization estimates that about 16% of adults, persons 18 years of age or older, are obese. So the fact that we exist within a world in which 16% of the population can't control their eating in order to maintain a healthy weight is also a world in which over a billion tonnes of food are wasted and in which millions starve to death every year indicates to me that we're not going to be capable of resolving major problems associated with interstellar travel (which is obviously a necessity if our species is going to survive for billions of years).

If we had any sense we also wouldn't be burying corpses filled with embalming fluids in caskets constructed of metal and treated wood; those corpses need to be decomposed in order to add the nutrients back into the soil and all of those chemicals are just terrible for the soil and the organisms within said soil. Cemeteries are also just wasting space that would be better utilized for literally any other purpose. Cemeteries exist to memorialize people who will be nothing more than a name (unless they happen to become famous) after 40 or so years anyway. What percentage of headstones within a cemetery are anything more than a name to anyone nowadays? What percentage of corpses within cemeteries belonged to people who were intimately known by those living today?

We bury who knows what quantity of various metals under tonnes of dirt each year and not just in caskets with corpses. We bury who knows what quantity of valuable metals and other materials in landfills because we're too stupid and lazy to prevent the foolish disposal of still usable goods and we're too stupid and lazy to reuse and recycle materials. Hard to say what quantities of finite materials are buried under dirt for no good reason.

Then of course there's all the materials we've lost to the seas and oceans which we'll almost certainly never recover. Losses due largely to nonsensical, inefficient, production and distribution of materials and goods like "it was 10 cents cheaper per unit to manufacture these t-shirts halfway around the world so we'll ship them 10 million at a time and make a bit of extra profit". Shipping those materials half way around the world and losing finite resources in the process wasn't worth the waste even if some rich asshole made a slightly larger profit margin off of that manufacturing arrangement in the long-run. Any waste is unacceptable because no material exists in infinite quantities and materials sinking to the bottom of the sea or ocean is especially catastrophic because they can no longer be profitably recovered in most cases.

A lot of hobbies are responsible for an insane amount of waste. Golf is a great example of waste. Estimates say that golf is responsible for at least one billion gallons of water being wasted each day across the USA. Exact figures on the quantity of water wasted on this dumb game are hard to come by but any waste is unacceptable because suffering is unacceptable. Waste creates suffering; the water wasted on this dumb game could be used to prevent dehydration deaths or to water crops or cool nuclear reactors or anything else that would be infinitely more useful than some rich people

wandering around to hit a ball with a stick.

All sports are wasting finite resources, not just the ones that the wealthy enjoy and actually participate in. We could get into the details on the water wasted for soccer or the fuel and oil wasted to maintain fields, the fuel wasted so that idiots can watch this garbage in person, human labor power that could've been put towards ending hunger or homelessness but I'm not going to get into the exact details. The waste should be obvious, if it isn't then you need to think about the issue for more than five minutes. It's really funny because as a species we've already produced probably tens of thousands of hours of footage of soccer anyway, probably hundreds of thousands of hours of footage for boxing, probably hundreds of thousands of hours of footage of rugby matches etc. The waste has already happened, the least we can do is be sensible and minimize future waste by only watching games that have already been recorded; quit financing and participating in the waste of finite resources. Millions of people are dying in agony every year and this suffering can be averted if we're more efficient and productive.

Teachers are another massively wasteful profession. The lessons can simply be recorded and the recording can be used universally and indefinitely. We don't need millions of different people to train a single generation how to perform basic arithmetic operations or how magnetism works or about the evolution of life or about any other topic. We can get the best writers to write out the lesson plan and we can get the best presenter to recite the script and then it's done; this way we're not tying up the labor power of millions on something that can be accomplished by a video recording. Whatever problems you want to list off with this approach to education already exist as things are. "The students won't pay attention to a video" well then why have we used videos in classrooms, even at the college level, for decades? Furthermore a teacher won't ensure that the students pay attention, it's just a deluded notion. What is the actual benefit, aside from motivating some students to succeed, of having a teacher in the classroom over a recording? Parents and media should be properly motivating children to take their education seriously. Motivating students to succeed isn't sufficient reason to burn up the labor power of millions of people (within the USA alone) each year. If you're fine with millions of people doing something that a recording can do just as well then I don't want to hear you complain about any suffering that happens anywhere because you're an idiot too stupid to identify the primary causes of

suffering in the world.

I could go on forever listing off all of the waste of human labor power and of finite resources that are preventing us from alleviating suffering. Mowing lawns is a really funny example because we're wasting all of the materials for the equipment to mow the grass and trim weeds around tight spots like fences and sheds and we're wasting petroleum to mow and trim the same plot of land indefinitely instead of finding a permanent solution like planting herbs that grow only a certain height or laying down a slab of concrete, laying down gravel, putting down artificial turf etc. This waste becomes really noticeable when you look at public parks that need mowed and trimmed. We've got who knows how many healthy adults mowing grass and trimming weeds in an endless battle for no reason; it's really stupid that we've decided to waste labor power and resources in that way.

Landlords are parasites, real estate agents don't really do anything and people involved in marketing aren't doing anything useful either. Fast food workers are more beneficial to society than landlords, real estate agents and marketing teams yet fast food workers don't get paid nearly as well as any of the people engaged in those occupations.

Then of course there's the fact that the wealthy just hoard and waste resources on garbage like jewelry, houses large enough to shelter thousands of people, joyriding extremely fuel inefficient vehicles etc. The vast majority of the wealthy don't do anything productive, their entire existence is parasitic; they don't work and they're not using their free time to do anything beneficial for anyone else.

Flying around the world for meetings or for performances is a truly gigantic waste of resources. What are you going to say at a physical meeting that can't be said over a video call? What are you going to hear at a live concert (aside from noise from idiots in the crowd who you're ostensibly not there to listen to in the first place) that can't be heard through a broadcast?

Then of course there's all the waste in war, in conflicts over resources or ideas. Suffering aside, war just wastes so many resources it's ridiculous. All of the metals used to construct bombs, guns, bullets, tanks and sea vessels etc. could be providing people with high quality, durable and affordable vehicles and housing. Then of course there's all the electronics and rare minerals going to waste so that we can slaughter one another over some resources or ideas. There's all the fuel and labor power being wasted. All of the extra calories burned by soldiers during training and in the field. All that's ever been accomplished in any "successful"

war is the enrichment of the ruling classes of one nation at the expense of everyone else (including the lower classes of the "victorious" nation) and at the expense of finite resources. Suffering inflicted upon many for the exclusive benefit of a few and at the cost of many scarce resources. War is one of the greatest examples of wasted suffering, wasted labor and wasted resources conceivable. Wars are always a catastrophe. I doubt we'll be capable of eliminating our violent impulses before we drive ourselves to the brink of extinction.

Speaking of violent impulses I could also talk about the other personality defects that are heritable or are culturally inculcated which present a major problem to the continued functioning of civilization. Could talk about how selfishness, greed and lust are all seen as socially acceptable and how disobeying authorities and violating the laws are seen as "cool". Could talk about how popular media, especially music, glorify successful criminals. Western culture has become dysfunctional in that pro-social values are no longer held in the same esteem which they once were.

I could spend hundreds of pages listing off waste if I were so inclined and if I felt like getting into the details but what I've said thus far should give optimists misgivings about the future prospects of humanity. Most people are too stupid to even identify the problems I've listed off within this chapter; so it's highly unlikely that the problems will be resolved in the near future.

I could also spend dozens of pages getting into the psychological problems that are proliferating but hopefully you get the picture.

There's no cause for optimism regarding the future. The problems I've covered are the tip of the iceberg and I didn't get into every aspect of those problems anyway.

Chapter IV: Miscellaneous Observations

This chapter is just a place for me to state some things upon topics about which I feel strongly but couldn’t fit in with any previous sections in a way that I felt flowed well.

Condemned to live, determined to die; that's the reality for all organisms. Condemned by our parents to live and determined by our biology to decline and shut down.

Most decisions, even a large portion of important decisions, are made irrationally. The rationale given in support of a decision is often constructed or adopted from someone else post-hoc (after the fact).

I didn’t really get into anti-natalism much because arguments against continuing life, in a way, supersede those against propagating life. If life isn’t worthy of being lived, of being continued, it obviously isn’t worth beginning. Nevertheless may as well get into it anyway.

No one can articulate a good reason to procreate. A reason isn’t necessary (it isn’t a physical requirement for the deed to be done) but if you’re going to do something, especially something so impactful, you should have a good reason for doing so but that’s just my opinion ultimately. I try not to be stupid and thoughtless enough to make such important decisions without considering the ramifications.

The reason that the vast majority of us are here is because our parents wanted some entertainment and because they were too stupid to do anything to prevent or terminate pregnancy. All sentient beings are victims of our parent’s biologically programmed and unconscious desire to receive stimulation and our DNA has made it so that we’re rewarded for engaging in sex because the DNA wants itself copied. Don’t be a mindless slave to your DNA. You should use your superior intelligence to make better decisions than every other dumb animal upon the planet; you shouldn’t create suffering by creating sufferers.

Having children is reckless and stupid; and intentionally having children is also narcissistic and selfish in addition to the aforesaid. Having children is reckless and stupid because you’re creating a new sufferer whose conditions and quality of life you’re incapable of guaranteeing. All sentient beings are guaranteed to suffer but they’re not guaranteed to have any semblance of what you or, more

importantly, what they would regard as an acceptable and even worthwhile life. To start with the majority of parents can't actually afford to finance the lifetime of their offspring; even at the most basic level. Millions of children die every year from starvation or dehydration; millions of some of the most agonizing deaths imaginable every year because several million impoverished people were too stupid and irresponsible to prevent or terminate pregnancy even though they were aware that they couldn't actually afford to finance even the early years of their progeny.

You should have enough money set aside before having the child to finance their entire lifetime because for all you know the child will be born or will develop some ailment that doesn't enable them to work for a living and you could die at any time. When I was younger I actually knew someone whose father had passed away (in a house fire) when the son was extremely young and his widowed wife and orphaned son were always impoverished. Anyway there have been countless people whose parents have died or who were too irresponsible to finance (even the early years of) the existence of their children and it just creates an insane amount of hardship for the children.

I agree with Danny Shine when he says that parents really need to finance the entirety of their children's lives as a matter of principle. No one should be obliged to work because their parents were too stupid and irresponsible to prevent their existence or because their parents were so deranged that they actually felt that procreating was a good idea. If you want me to exist you should finance my existence, I didn't choose to come into existence. Everyone should be actively suing their parents for reparations. No one should be forced to do anything, especially since they didn't even consent to being born with which to start.

Life is especially aggravating because of the laws around the world which oblige you to continue existing. You're legally obligated to continue life. There exists no country upon the Earth in which access to a painless, effortless and guaranteed death is freely (in terms of cost and physical accessibility) available without restriction. So as the author of Ever-Deeper-Honesty says life is prison/torture/slavery/rape because you're forced into existence by your parents (rape), you're a slave in that you're forced to perform any number of tasks in order to continue existing, you're tortured because you're guaranteed to suffer and life is a prison because you're legally obligated to continue existing and face penalties for attempting to escape.

No one is really inclined to acknowledge it but everything that happens to a person is ultimately the responsibility of the parents. The parents are the sole and direct reason that the child exists. Who else is (ultimately) to blame for everything that befalls a person? Yes, people are obviously responsible for their own actions and should be held accountable for their decisions but a serial killer for example wouldn't have been able to kill anyone had they not been conceived and born. Of course people who claim that life is good will flip that around and say that every good thing that has ever been done is ultimately because whoever performed whatever good deeds was conceived and born but as I covered earlier the "goods" of this life are merely an alleviation of suffering. The "good" things in this life are the solutions to problems, they're the alleviation, the burden being lifted. Existence isn't good in and of itself and the "good" things that happen are merely resolutions to problems that no one would experience if they hadn't been conceived and born with which to start. No one needs to come into existence to resolve problems because problems exist only for the living and life itself is unnecessary.

Consciously reproducing is selfish and narcissistic because you're creating a new sufferer, a new need machine, to satisfy some defect, some inadequacy, in your life. Creating suffering (unless it's to prevent worse suffering in the future) is unacceptable. You can invent whatever garbage excuse or story or "meaning" you want to try to justify suffering but you're just an asshole. There's nothing I can say that would justify me burning you with a blowtorch; everyone would acknowledge that that's an evil, fucked up and inexcusable thing to do; it would only be the right course of action if the infliction of that suffering prevented it from happening to twenty other people but even then it's still terrible that any suffering has to happen at all.

Creating a new being capable of suffering to satisfy some desire of your own, instrumentalizing other people, is fucked up, it's literally slavery. You're creating a new person and then exerting control over them for however many years until they break free of your control or until you die so that you can get pleasant neurological sensations from interacting with them (or at the very least knowing that your genetics are "out there somewhere" even if you don't interact with your offspring).

Procreating is narcissistic because you imagine that you're special enough to warrant replicating a little less than half of your genome (because obviously we're not exactly 50% related to either parent due to mutations). You're not

special, you're not important and the suffering of your children isn't an acceptable price for your happiness, fuck you. Fix whatever is wrong in your life instead of trying to create new need machines to satisfy your own desires. If you genuinely want to be around children in order to "mould better people for the future" or whatever nonsense then you can adopt one of the millions of children who have lost or been abandoned by their parents. Adoption alleviates suffering and creating new sufferers obviously creates suffering. So if you want to create a better future by interacting with children then adopt them, don't create them.

The least malevolent parents are those who bring children into the world so that they can "enjoy life" and who imagine that everything will be fine i.e. they're delusional and inconsiderate. These delusional and inconsiderate parents, in spite of their "nice" intentions still create a great deal of suffering. How many billions of people are the product of these "well intentioned" parents? How many victims of cancer, polio, malaria, rape, murder etc. are the product of these deluded people?

As Danny Shine says no one can provide a logical and ethical reason for bringing someone into existence. The "reasons" for procreating all boil down to the selfishness, narcissism or delusion of parents and those "reasons" are typically post-hoc in any event; most children aren't intended.

Even the purely selfish reasons for procreating are short-sighted, stupid and delusional. There's no guarantee that your children will want anything to do with you and there's no guarantee that they're even going to be capable of supporting you in any way. Even if you're just out for companionship you're assuming that you're going to appreciate the personality that your child develops which is a pointless and stupid risk to take when you could easily find any number of existing people with whom to associate who would be to your liking.

Parents and prospective parents will rattle off crazy shit like "my kids will cure cancer" or "my kids will be great people who will contribute to society" or whatever other rot their deluded minds want to concoct. It's a just a baseless assumption, there's no justification for assuming that your children will be extraordinary. The rational assumption is that they'll work at some typical job that merely perpetuates the status quo without actually improving standards of living to any great degree. Don't get me wrong, plumbers, mailmen electricians, store clerks etc. are all essential for maintaining a functional society but they're not producing a

paradigm shift, they're not alleviating a great of suffering; at least the individual workers aren't anyway.

However, the people with this view are overlooking the fact that every person born is part of the problem, we're all at least indirectly responsible for the suffering of others. Even if you sit within your home and never leave you're still instrumentalizing the suffering of others so that you can have food, electricity, running water etc. Whether we're inclined to acknowledge it or not we're all making use of the suffering of others so that we can fulfill our basic biological needs and satisfy our desires. As the author of Ever-Deeper-Honesty says humanity is collectively responsible for enslaving itself; everyone is made use of to fulfill some function and no one has access to a painless, effortless, guaranteed and permanent means of exiting existence. Life and by extension human civilization isn't worthy of being upheld because they're arenas for suffering; they're actually of negative value and should be erased.

If you believe in the possibility of eternal torment after death then reproducing is the biggest gamble you could ever make on behalf of someone else. Why would you procreate when the possibility exists that they'll be tormented eternally after death? What pleasurable experiences within a finite life could ever make up for an eternity of torment?

In no way is procreating a wise, ethical, responsible, selfless or productive decision. The best case scenario for your child is that they're not obligated to work and are a parasite upon everyone else and the best case scenario for society is that your child actually does do something extremely productive (like devise some new technical process or develop a new medical treatment) but either way nothing will be dramatically altered and every birth contributes to the continuation of the enslavement of humanity by humanity.

Abstract concepts aren't true i.e. they're not factual. This can be demonstrated best by the fact that a concept like freedom can be interpreted in many different ways. A lot of people would argue that to be free means that there aren't any legal restrictions upon what you may do to yourself and someone else might respond that that definition of freedom is faulty because it simply means that a person is now capable of tying themselves down with more chains, wrapping themselves up in any number of addictions as they're no longer restricted by the government from doing so.

Another proof that abstract conceptions aren't descriptive of reality is that there is no universally accepted code of ethics or agreed upon definition of god or fairness etc.

The facts of existence are what we should deal with and not our vague abstract notions. To get back to the example of freedom and addiction; freedom is an abstraction that could be defined in any number of ways whereas addiction is a real physical phenomena. So in any analysis of the aforesaid scenario in which a person is legally empowered to treat their body however they like without restriction it is the facts, like addiction, that need to be given consideration and not concepts like justice, rights, fairness or freedom.

The real strength of efilism in my opinion is that time isn't wasted dealing with nonsensical concepts. The facts of reality are described and conclusions are drawn from an analysis of reality as it actually is, without embellishment, without demonization and without romanticization. The unvarnished truth is what everyone should be analyzing and working with. The material facts are consequential. Phantasms, like god, aren't consequential in and of themselves; phantasms are consequential only insofar as they're believed and acted upon.

Atheists can't tell you why human lives should be valued above those of other animals. People who believe in the supernatural at least have the excuse that they're capable of inventing stupid reasons to be human supremacists but I have yet to hear a high quality rationale in defense of human supremacism from atheists. By human supremacism I mean the view that because we're "better" than other animals that we're entitled to treat them in any way we like.

I suppose you could say that our intelligence justifies human supremacism but there are some individual animals more intelligent than some of the dumbest humans so that argument doesn't exactly track. On average we're far more intelligent than other animals and we've developed our communication skills far beyond those of any other animal but I fail to see how these could be used to justify exploiting and abusing animals. Higher intelligence doesn't justify the infliction of pain; if it did then the most intelligent members of society should be able to use the majority of people however they like; the most intelligent members of society should be legally empowered to kidnap, imprison, torture and enslave the less intelligent by that logic.

It can't be our genetics that justifies human supremacism either because we share almost all of our genes with chimpanzees and bonobos yet they should not be accorded the same legal status as humans according to most people, especially according to most meat eaters.

I also want to briefly address the tiny minority of atheists who are opposed to abortion. Taking all I've said in the previous pages into account one should see that there's no good reason to oppose abortion and in fact abortion is the 2nd best outcome (in regards to procreation) after the prevention of conception altogether. Humanity isn't special; as an atheist you shouldn't consider the endless propagation of our genetics as a sensible goal and if our genes are really so special and it's so important that they be endlessly replicated then we need to take steps to ensure that the genetics of our closest relatives (chimpanzees and bonobos) are also propagated as widely as possible across the cosmos. Of course no one can articulate in what way a genome is special or why it's important that it be replicated and the majority of atheists have no concern for preserving the genes of other primates.

The majority of humanity are so inconsiderate, sociopathic, dismissive, intellectually lazy and stupid that dealing with them is borderline intolerable for me. They're inconsiderate of the consequences of their own actions, sociopathically unconcerned with suffering, dismissive of everything which disrupts their preconceptions, too intellectually lazy to consider the implications of their own proposals (e.g. eternal existence) and too stupid to identify the truth when it's presented to them.

The most important legal right that can be accorded to the people is access to an effortless, painless, instantaneous and guaranteed death. If access to an effortless, painless, instantaneous and guaranteed is being prevented then everyone within that society is entrapped within their life; they're imprisoned and forced to suffer.

A society which says that it's fine for a person to be legally obligated to continue existing in spite of their desire to end their life is implicitly saying that it's fine to entrap people, to torment them, to rape them and to enslave them. This is because everyone is trapped within a life they never consented to having, a life which is full of suffering and in which they required to fulfill certain tasks to continue existing. Life is inherently and best defined as prison-torture-rape-slavery. People who oppose right to die will implicitly describe life as slavery; they'll claim that we're obligated to continue living in order to serve others.

People only oppose assisted suicide because they want to use everyone, either directly or indirectly. Obviously people don't want those to whom they're closely connected ending

their lives because then they won't be able to receive pleasure from interacting with them and these opponents of assisted suicide don't want people they don't know committing suicide because it lowers productivity and it might encourage people that they personally know to end their own lives.

In short, opponents of assisted suicide are selfish. In truth everyone is selfish and hypocritical. In any event a person who truly loved someone would support their decision because non-existence is the safest state (really non-state) that one can be (not be) in. Death resolves all problems and prevents the appearance of new problems. Death alleviates and prevents all pain. As bizarre as it may sound to those addicted to life; if you truly love someone and if you're not a fool, if you've come to the realizations I have, you'll encourage them to die or at the very least convey to them that death isn't bad.

Some people really claim that they're interested in existing forever which to me sounds like a nightmare irrespective of the circumstances. Can't imagine myself being capable of being entertained indefinitely as I'm already bored with existence and I'm not even 30 years old. You must be pretty simple, must be pretty easily amused, to even imagine that you could be satisfied with eternal existence. I'm not convinced that anyone actually could be satisfied existing indefinitely but it says a lot, to me anyway, that some people are capable of convincing themselves that they're actually interested in eternal life.